

Also, a bill (H. R. 10616) granting an increase of pension to Christina Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10617) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10618) granting a pension to Harrison R. Creclius; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10619) granting a pension to Agnes Rayburn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10620) granting a pension to Maggie Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10621) for the relief of the New Jersey Shipbuilding & Dredging Co., of Bayonne, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 10622) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10623) granting an increase of pension to Elmira H. Streeter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 10624) to enlarge the powers of the Washington Hospital for Foundlings, and to enable it to accept the devise and bequest contained in the will of Randolph T. Warwick; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 10625) for the relief of Leon E. Adle; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MacLAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 10626) granting an increase of pension to John E. Markley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10627) granting a pension to Elizabeth Lancaster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10628) granting an increase of pension to James Holley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10629) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Y. Teters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10630) for the relief of Washington County, S. C. Kile estate, and Martha Frye estate; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 10631) for the relief of Harold G. Billings; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10632) granting a pension to Mary J. Hodgkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10633) granting a pension to Adaline R. Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 10634) granting a pension to Gertie Riley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 10635) granting a pension to Mary J. Alton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10636) granting a pension to Lucy J. Wright Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10637) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda E. Spillman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10638) granting a pension to Stella May Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 10639) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Botkin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 10640) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 10641) for the relief of Johanna B. Weinberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 10642) granting an increase of pension to Harriett L. Steele; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 10643) granting an increase of pension to Edmund P. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Resolution (H. Res. 377) to pay E. V. Wilmer and Claude Warren one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3135. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., Boston, Mass., favoring proposed legislation increasing pensions of Civil and Spanish War veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Pensions.

3136. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of L'Union St. Jean-Baptiste D'Amerique, protesting against the passage of any legislation tending to establish a Federal bureau of education; to the Committee on Education.

3137. Also, petition of Kearsarge Association of Naval Veterans, urging the construction of a cruiser for the United States Navy to be named the *Kearsarge*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3138. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Democratic County Committee of New York County, heartily approving of the postal salary bill (S. 1898) and urging its passage by Congress at the present session; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3139. By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: Petition of Opal G. Cochran, Mrs. Ida Remer, W. P. Ellis, Miss Florence Bishop, L. J. Cassidy, Mrs. Nancy J. Cochran, et al., 67 names in all, of Eldorado Springs, Mo., for keeping separate church and State, but against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) or any other religious legislation now pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3140. By Mr. GUYER: Petition of various citizens of Miami County, Kans., urging the enactment of legislation increasing widows' pensions to \$50 per month, and for pioneer and homeless widows of the veterans of the Civil War to \$72 per month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3141. Also, petition of various citizens of Iola, Kans., protesting the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218), or any other religious legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3142. By Mr. LYON: Petition of certain citizens of Wilmington, N. C., opposing the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3143. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Democratic County Committee, county of New York, urging the enactment into law of Senate bill 1898; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3144. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of Cleveland City Council, Cleveland, Ohio, urging Congress to enact into law Senate bill 1898; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3145. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Lions Club of Jamaica, Long Island, N. Y., favoring the postal salary increase bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3146. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of residents of Gresham, Oreg., and residents of Multnomah County, Oreg., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218; also residents of Pleasant Home, Oreg., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3147. By Mr. SITES: Affidavits accompanying House bill 10576, granting an increase of pension to certain persons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

3148. By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Indiana County, Pa., opposed to the compulsory Sunday observance bill and any other national religious legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3149. By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of officers and members of the Kearsarge Association of Naval Veterans, Boston, Mass., urging Congress to construct a cruiser for the United States Navy to be named the *Kearsarge*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3150. Also, petition of Army and Navy Union, Boston, Mass., favoring proposed legislation to increase the pensions of Civil and Spanish War veterans and their widows and children; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### SENATE

THURSDAY, December 11, 1924

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 10, 1924)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

SENATOR FROM IOWA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of election of Mr. SMITH W. BROOKHART for the term of six years beginning the 4th day of March, 1925.

It is necessary to make an observation in respect to this matter. Some days ago I laid before the Senate a certificate of election of Mr. BROOKHART supposing it to be addressed to the President of the Senate. I find that the certificate formerly laid before the Senate is a certificate addressed to Mr. BROOKHART individually. So this certificate will be printed in the RECORD and filed with the Secretary of the Senate, and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] is at liberty, if he chooses to do so, to withdraw from the files of the Senate the former certificate.

The credentials were ordered to be filed and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF IOWA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1924, Hon. SMITH W. BROOKHART was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1925.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Iowa.

Done at Des Moines this 5th day of December, 1924.

[SEAL.]

N. E. KENDALL,  
Governor of Iowa.

By the Governor:

W. C. RAMSAY,  
Secretary of State.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed bills of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2688. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9634. An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. SIMMONS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wilmington, N. C., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McLEAN presented the petition of Local Union No. 175, Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America, of Danbury, Conn., praying for the passage of legislation providing for the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a resolution of Enfield Grange, No. 151, of Hazardville, Conn., favoring the passage of the so-called Norris bill, providing for development of the Muscle Shoals project and for the production of fertilizers from air nitrates, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented the petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Pawcatuck, Conn., praying for the passage of the bill (H. R. 6645) to amend the national prohibition act, to provide for a bureau of prohibition in the Treasury Department, and to define its powers and duties, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented letters and telegrams in the nature of petitions from employees of the United States post office of New London; post-office clerks of Stamford; National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of Ansonia; post-office clerks of Willimantic; Connecticut National Federation of Post Office Clerks, of Middletown; Elm City Stationary Engineers' Association, No. 10, of Connecticut; National Association of Stationary Engineers; and Edgewood Lodge, No. 11, Knights of Pythias, of New Haven, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased compensation to postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Willimantic, Norwich, South Coventry, Eagleville, North Windham, South Windham, Jewett City, Lebanon, and Warrenville, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF THE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. JONES of Washington, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3613. An act to provide for retirement for disability in the Lighthouse Service (Rept. No. 800); and

S. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to authorize the United States Shipping Board to adjust the claim of the Near East Relief (Rept. No. 801).

REPORT OF TREATIES FROM COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BORAH, as in executive session, reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations treaties between the United States and Canada, the United States and Panama, the United States and France, and the United States and the Netherlands, to aid in the suppression of the smuggling of intoxicating liquors, which were ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

A bill (S. 3634) granting an increase of pension to Myra L. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3635) for the relief of Walter D. Mattice;

A bill (S. 3636) for the relief of Edward Burg; and

A bill (S. 3637) for the relief of Charles E. Dern; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 3638) granting a pension to Helena E. Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A bill (S. 3639) granting the consent of Congress to the Harrisburg Bridge Co. and its successors to reconstruct its bridge across the Susquehanna River at a point opposite Market Street, Harrisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3640) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River south of Chelan Falls, Wash.;

A bill (S. 3641) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at Vantage Ferry, Wash.; and

A bill (S. 3642) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Washington to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Columbia River at Kettle Falls, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 3643) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Ambridge and Woodlawn, Beaver County, Pa.; to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McNARY submitted the following amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 10020, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

That all unexpended balances of all sums provided for this purpose by H. R. 9559, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, be, and the same are, hereby reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1926. Owyhee project, Oregon: For investigation, commencement of construction, and incidental operations, the unexpended balance of this appropriation contained in H. R. 9559 and the amendments thereto for the above purposes for the year of 1925 is hereby reappropriated and made available for 1926.

To be inserted at the proper places in the bill.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 2688. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9634. An act to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request which I would like to present to the Senate, and which I hope very much Senators will allow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the Senator explain what it is?

Mr. HALE. I will explain very briefly what it is. At the close of the last session the bill (H. R. 8687) to authorize alterations to certain naval vessels and to provide for the construction of additional vessels was introduced in the House. The bill provided an authorization for the conversion of certain battleships from coal to oil burners and for putting deck and under-water protection on those battleships. It also provided an authorization for the construction of six gunboats for use upon the Yangtse River in China and for the construction of eight light cruisers with a draft of 10,000 tons. It was simply an authorization. It was not an appropriation bill.



The bill passed the House of Representatives and came to the Senate. It passed the Senate and was finally held up on a motion by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to reconsider the vote by which it was passed. I tried to get action on the motion to reconsider during the last days of the session, but owing to the pressure of work before the Senate I was unable to do so. The condition of the bill, therefore, is now that it is on the table with the motion by the junior Senator from Utah to reconsider pending. Until the bill passes, it is impossible to take up with the Appropriations Committee the matter of the appropriations that will carry out the purposes of the bill. The Budget Bureau can not make its estimates until the authorization is allowed by the Congress. I hope very much that the Senate will agree to let me take up the matter now. I do not think it will take very much of the time of the Senate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand the proposition of the Senator, he desires to dispose of the motion to reconsider.

Mr. HALE. That is all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. When that is disposed of the bill will go through?

Mr. HALE. Yes; when that motion is disposed of the bill will go through.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If it is laid before the Senate, is the Senator willing to immediately move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider?

Mr. HALE. I would be willing to do so; but I do not believe that would be fair to the Senator from Utah in case he has anything to say on the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not want to stand in the way of the Senator disposing of a meritorious bill, but I certainly do not want to have the bill in regard to Muscle Shoals delayed in its passage. I suppose the Senator having the whip handle can move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, and by virtue of that fact can come to terms with the Senator from Utah about how long he will speak. I would like to have that done before I consent to take up the motion.

Mr. HALE. While a motion to lay on the table is not debatable, the motion to take up the motion to reconsider is debatable. I hope very much that the Senator from Utah will make his fight, if he has a fight to make on the matter, when it comes before the Appropriations Committee. This is purely an authorization, and until the authorization is made the Budget's hands are tied, and we can not take it up in connection with the Navy Department appropriation bill, which is shortly coming before the Senate.

I hope very much that the Senate will grant my unanimous-consent request. If I find that the matter leads to prolonged debate, I shall withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8687. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, that is with the understanding that it does not displace the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not displace the unfinished business except for the time that the Senate may take in consideration of the bill called up by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to have the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] state how much time he expects to take if the matter comes up, because if it does come up and we can not get an understanding as to the time to be taken, I shall move to lay the motion on the table, though I am willing to yield any reasonable amount of time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that, in the language of the Senator from Alabama, he and the Senator from Maine have the whip handle, and a motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table would be in order and would cut off debate. I shall consume, however, I can assure the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Alabama, only a very short time in presenting a few remarks in regard to the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand from the Senator from Utah that the debate will not be extended, and, of course, I take his word for it.

Mr. DILL. That does not preclude other Senators from speaking on the matter if they care to do so, of course.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all. If there is any extended debate, however, I shall object and move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. DILL. Is the Senator going to object to another Senator speaking on the matter?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all. What I mean is that if it is the understanding of the Senator that there is not going to be extended debate I am willing to let it have such time as is necessary, but if it does require extended debate, of course it has not a place here this morning. Does the Senator from Washington desire to speak at any length?

Mr. DILL. I do not want to be precluded by the statement that if other Senators are going to take any amount of time the Senator is going to object. I think that is hardly a fair proposition. If the matter comes before the Senate, it will be here until it is disposed of one way or the other.

Mr. HALE. It can be disposed of in a very short time. The bill went through the Senate without an objection. I do not think the Senator from Utah desires to occupy very much time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not intend to preclude the Senator from Washington at all, but if he intends to make an extended address I do not want the bill to come up.

Mr. DILL. I do not intend to do so, but if the Senator from Utah makes his address I think other Senators should not be precluded from speaking.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and lays before the Senate the bill to which reference has been made. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed the Senate. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I appreciate that the parliamentary status of the bill under consideration precludes an extended discussion, and it is not my intention to discuss the various questions directly or indirectly related to the measure upon which action is demanded.

This bill was presented to the Senate in the closing hours of the last Congress; and, as I now recall, the Navy Department brought it to the attention of the House a few days before it passed that body. It would seem that the department did not consider the bill sufficiently important to ask for its passage, when Congress convened, nor to seek to have it made a part of the general naval bill. The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs gave but slight attention to the bill, the hearings being perfunctory and lasting but a short time. I was not advised of the fact that the bill was presented to the committee or would be considered by the committee until a few minutes before the committee met. Without having an opportunity to read the bill or to learn the facts attending its presentation, I was compelled to vote in the committee on it. I voted in the negative, because I felt that no proper consideration had been given the measure and because I believed that the situation of the Navy called for an investigation of various problems, and the drafting of a comprehensive bill that would deal with the wants and needs of the Navy in a proper and complete manner.

The bill was rushed through the Senate without opportunity being afforded the opponents of the bill to present their objections. As soon as I learned that the bill had passed the Senate, I interposed a motion to reconsider. The Senate adjourned, with the motion pending, and the Senator from Maine now seeks to have the motion disposed of.

Mr. President, my fundamental opposition to the bill essentially rested upon the ground that it was piecemeal legislation. I believed that it was unwise to enter upon the construction of new war vessels until Congress was fully advised as to the needs of the Navy. Congress was not in possession of that full and complete information essential to intelligent action respecting naval development. In my opinion, Congress often makes the mistake of legislating upon vital and important matters in a desultory and incomplete way. It projects measures without full knowledge of the facts or an exhaustive inquiry as to the problems and difficulties to be encountered. As a result there is much patchwork legislation; subjects are dealt with in a wholly inadequate and imperfect manner. Appropriations are squandered or at least in part dissipated in the execution of imperfect and unsatisfactory policies. Wisdom dictates that before appropriations are made, the subject calling for the same, should be thoroughly examined and all problems related thereto fully investigated.

It has been known since the lessons of the war were brought to our attention that the situation in the Navy called for drastic reforms. Needed reforms were opposed by reactionary forces powerful in naval circles. There was a fanatical and determined effort made by some persons in the Navy Department and outside its limits to push through a program which had been prepared before the war and which therefore did not take into account material and important modifications which the experiences of the war showed to be neces-

sary. There was an incomprehensible attitude toward needed reforms and toward the construction of instrumentalities essential in a modern navy. Efforts to limit the number of capital ships and to devote a part of the costs that would be incurred in their construction to the building of submarines, aircraft, and aircraft carriers were resisted.

For a number of years I have insisted that greater attention be given to the construction of naval craft which the recent war demonstrated were imperatively required. We have been spending hundreds of millions of dollars annually since the war without getting adequate results. In my opinion millions have been wasted in overhead and in unnecessary activities. Money which should have been devoted to the construction of needed submarines, aircraft, swift cruisers, and other naval vessels was expended in avenues which have contributed but little to the efficiency or development of the Navy. I have insisted that a proper naval program be adopted—one that would bring our Navy to a high degree of efficiency and make it in every respect a modern and up-to-date fighting machine.

I have felt that the policies of the Navy have brought discouragements to its personnel and have resulted in a loss of morale among both the officers and the enlisted men. This has been demonstrated in the large number of resignations upon the part of officers and a great number of desertions among the enlisted personnel.

I believe the situation of the Navy is such as to call for a comprehensive investigation—an investigation not to tear down but to build up, and to obtain facts which should be the bases of legislation that will bring the Navy to that high standard of perfection and efficiency desired by the fine officers and men found in the Navy, as well as by the great majority of the American people.

I have upon a number of occasions challenged attention to what I believed to be needed reforms in the Navy, and have criticized certain policies which I believed were obstacles to the creation of a suitable Navy. I have had no friends to reward or enemies to punish, and have been guided only by a sense of public duty and a desire to improve our Navy and to utilize the large appropriations made to the best advantage.

I have felt during the past few years that the Navy Department has not measured up to the responsibilities resting upon it or to the reasonable demands of informed and patriotic citizens.

In May of this year I offered a resolution which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs. I hoped that the resolution would be promptly adopted so that the investigation called for might be speedily entered upon and concluded at the earliest possible moment, in order that Congress might have sufficient facts to enable it to intelligently deal with the problems and questions connected with our naval policies and the Navy Department. The resolution in part is as follows:

*Resolved*, That joint committee to consist of four Representatives, members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, to be appointed by the Speaker, and four Senators, members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to investigate the present condition of the Naval Establishment, and particularly to inquire into and report to Congress whether or not the so-called capital ships ratio of 5-5-3, as agreed on by the Washington Disarmament Conference, is being maintained on the part of the United States, or is being exceeded by the other powers to the agreement; the actual number of cruisers, destroyers, submarines, dirigibles, airplanes, and other auxiliary naval craft in the naval establishments of the other powers signatory to such agreement but not subject to such ratio; the number, class, and description of such auxiliary craft as may be regarded as adequate and necessary to the defense of the country; whether adequate attention has been given by the Navy Department to the construction of submarines, airplanes, and other auxiliary craft; the reasons for delay in completing the V boats now under construction; why no fleet submarines have been constructed; whether the submarines constructed have been efficient; why more airplanes have not been constructed, and whether those constructed are effective and of types comparable to those employed by naval powers; whether the General Board of the Navy is committed to archaic naval plans and archaic types of vessels and is preventing the proper development and perfection of such submarine, airplanes, and auxiliary craft as may be required for the defense of the country; whether a change should be made in the manner of appointing the General Board of the Navy; whether the administration of the Navy Department has tended to the bureaucratic domination of the expert technical officers of the Navy or has prevented the development of officers of such expert qualifications as are required for the technical work of the Navy; whether the recent accidents to naval vessels off the coast of California,

and recent casualties to submarines, have been due to deficient official and other personnel, or to lack of adequate sea training in the navigation of submarines and auxiliary craft; the number of navy yards, naval bases, and shore stations which should be maintained; the organization of the Navy Department, including the functions of the separate bureaus in the department, their interrelations, and their relations to the office of the Secretary of the Navy; whether the Navy Department is effectively and prudently expending the moneys appropriated for the Naval Establishment to the advantage of the Government and the potential defense of the country; and whether or not the acts of Congress respecting the organization of the Navy Department should be amended or supplemented by new legislation to secure a more effective expenditure of naval appropriations and to promote the orderly coordination and functioning of the department—and to make recommendations to Congress concerning the questions in the premises set forth.

The concluding paragraphs of the resolution contain the usual provisions for hearings, subpoenaing witnesses, and so forth. Briefly, I wish to call attention to that part of the resolution which directs the committee to investigate the present condition of our Navy and particularly to ascertain whether the capital ships' ratio of 5-5-3, agreed upon in the so-called disarmament conference, has been maintained on the part of the United States or has been departed from by the other parties to the treaty.

Many American citizens have felt that the so-called limitation of armaments conference did not deal fairly with our country. I opposed the treaty and voted against it because I believed that it would not be productive of good and did not deal with the questions involved in a proper or satisfactory manner. The United States was the only power participating in the conference that was superior in capital ships. In cruisers, submarines, airplanes, and other naval craft and instrumentalities the United States was surpassed by other powers. In the first place the conference did not invite all nations to participate, or many nations which were deeply interested in the question of limiting naval armaments. I felt that it was a mistake to restrict the conference to the participating powers, and it was my opinion that the United States surrendered the advantage which it had in the field of capital ships without getting any adequate results by such surrender.

The participating nations were left, after the treaty was signed, to devote their energies to the construction of submarines, aircraft, floating mines, and the development of other instrumentalities and forces to be employed in naval contests. The financial resources of either Great Britain, France, Italy, or Japan would not permit as large sums of money for naval construction as that which the United States, because of its superior wealth, might appropriate.

Modern capital ships called for tens of millions of dollars. We aided the other parties to the treaty by relieving them of the heavy burdens of constructing capital ships, but we left them free to build submarines, airplanes, mine layers, and other deadly naval craft. We relinquished by the treaty the field in which we were superior and left the other nations predominant in other fields of naval craft; and this was done though the lessons of the war revealed the weakness of battleships and the vital importance of submarines, airplane carriers, mine layers, and other forms of naval craft. Moreover, by the treaty we compelled the United States, when it reached the limit of capital-ship tonnage permitted by the treaty, to retain a number of capital ships such as the *Delaware*, *North Dakota*, and *Florida*, which were, if not obsolete, obsolescent, or at least so old and imperfect as to require millions of dollars to put them into shape for service.

The bill before us supports this last statement because it calls for alterations to the battleships *New York*, *Texas*, *Arkansas*, *Wyoming*, *Florida*, and *Utah*, costing approximately \$18,000,000. These vessels require protection against submarine attacks and the installation of protective appliances against air attacks, provisions for their conversion into oil-burning ships, and in some instances the installation of new fire-control devices. It is also a fact that the boilers of some of these capital ships, which were retained under the limitation of arms treaty, are so old and defective as to put the ships out of commission. It would seem as if the treaty required us to retain as a part of our capital-ship fleet a number of vessels that were fit only for the scrap heap. At any rate, under the treaty we are required to scrap capital ships and at the same time appropriate millions to put old and obsolescent ships into such condition that they can with safety be taken to sea.

The deplorable condition of our Navy has occasioned much criticism and has led naval officers, as well as naval experts, to affirm that even in the line of capital ships the United States



does not preserve the ratio of 5-5-3 but has dropped to a ratio of 5-3-3. Indeed, there are some who contend that our Navy, measured by the effectiveness of all of its units, sustains the relation or ratio of 5-1-3. This situation I have felt calls for an investigation, and when it is realized that we have appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars annually since the war and do not have a single fleet submarine except the *V-1*, which has just been constructed, and no suitable airships or airplane carriers or mine layers, and but a limited number of cruisers, then the necessity of a thorough and exhaustive investigation of our naval plans and policies and program and present condition of the Navy seems to me to be imperatively demanded. In the resolution calling for an investigation, a portion of which I have just read, numerous matters are mentioned, and I submit that to deal with them in a proper way information is required and a full knowledge of the facts must be had by Congress.

Senators are aware of the fact that there has been much criticism of the manner of selection of officers, and it has been charged that the method employed has resulted in controversy and resentment among the officers. It is a matter of common knowledge that numerous "accidents," so called, have occurred in naval operations in the past year. It will be recalled that recently an explosion occurred on the battleship *Mississippi* and that 44 officers and enlisted men were killed. My information is that this accident was due to negligence and official inefficiency. Certainly there was not sufficient care taken to provide suitable air pressure and proper agencies to be employed to clean the guns after firing huge projectiles. And a few days ago 8 or 10 men were killed on the *Trenton*, one of the new cruisers. Information has come to me as to the cause of this disaster. If my information is correct, there was negligence and inefficiency upon the part of the personnel in certain branches of the naval service. But a few months ago 8 or 10 of our warcraft were lost upon the coast of California; and this morning we read of the death of a number of officers and enlisted men and the destruction of the airplane in which they were flying. And quite recently we were advised of a submarine that submerged and failed to rise.

If I had time, I could refer to other disasters which would seem to indicate fault somewhere in the Navy. There should be an investigation of these disasters.

It is known that we have appropriated \$150,000,000 for submarines and yet have but one that can accompany the fleet. In a resolution that was offered for me by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Jones] on the 4th of this month attention is directed to this fact and to the fact that 124 submarines of various types have been constructed, many of which are unsatisfactory. This resolution directs attention to other matters and asks that an investigation be conducted by the Senate Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, I repeat that the naval problem is one of such great importance as to require further information before Congress is in a position to determine what policy it should adopt or what appropriations should be made.

Senators will recall that Admiral Coontz and Secretary Wilbur some time ago gave rather glowing reports as to the efficiency of the Navy and the high standard which it had obtained in all departments. The report submitted by Admiral Coontz with respect to the maneuvers of the ships under his control in 1924 conclusively demonstrates that our Navy is not in a satisfactory condition; indeed, that its condition is such as to require most drastic treatment. And more recent statements of Secretary Wilbur materially modify his earlier glowing reports.

The bill before us does not purport to reach the situation or to deal with the defects and imperfections that must be dealt with, and dealt with soon, if we are to have a suitable Navy. I have characterized the bill before us as piecemeal legislation. It is scarcely that. It is a system of patchwork legislation. I insist that if we are to have a Navy it should be an up-to-date and modern Navy, one that is efficient mechanically—if I am permitted to use that expression—as well as in the spirit, efficiency, and fine service of the officers and enlisted men. We must have a Navy which is not only an honor to our Nation but one which in all hours of danger will prove an invincible arm of defense. It must be a Navy in which the officers and enlisted men will have profound pride and to the development of which they will earnestly and joyously dedicate their lives.

Mr. President, I am only asking for the facts, for all the information that can be obtained, not only from the General Board but from officers and enlisted men, as well as from every other available source. I want to know what our policy is to be, what we are to do with the Philippines, what course we are to pursue with respect to Guam and Hawaii, what

plans are to be adopted with respect to naval bases—whether we are to construct submarines and aircraft, whether there is to be a limitation upon these forms of naval craft, as well as upon a multitude of other questions which are inseparably connected with our naval policy and with our naval operations. Only by a comprehensive investigation where we can obtain the views of experts as well as practical persons and get all the facts bearing upon these questions will we be in a position to legislate intelligently and properly.

The bill before us only authorizes the construction of gunboats to be used to terrify the Chinese and eight light cruisers and the repair of some of our old capital ships. It does not appropriate a single dollar.

I believe that the American people will not be satisfied until we know the facts. Some of the leading papers in the United States, as I am advised, take the position that the naval question is so important as to call for a thorough investigation. In this morning's *Washington Post*, one of the leading papers of the United States, appears an editorial which is worthy of consideration. I ask that it may be incorporated in my remarks without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, Thursday, December 11, 1924]

#### A NAVAL INQUIRY NEEDED

There is much confusion in the public mind as to the exact state of the United States Navy, but there is no doubt whatever that cruisers are needed and that several battleships are practically worthless on account of defective boilers. It is also evident that several gunboats are needed for the protection of the Americans in the interior of China. Therefore it is well that Congress should pass without delay the bill approved by the House at the last session providing for several cruisers, the reconditioning of battleships, and for four gunboats.

But this legislation does not meet the situation. The question of aviation is left unsettled, and no provision is made for bringing the aircraft carriers *Lexington* and *Saratoga* up to date. No additional submarines are provided for, and yet submarines are a necessity. Secretary Wilbur points out that the relative strength of the world's fleets depends upon their position. The American fleet is strong in American waters, but would be weak in Asiatic waters. Battleships dare not cross the seas nowadays, with submarines lurking in their path, destroyers to intercept them with torpedoes, and airplanes to bomb them. Unless a fleet is equipped with submarines, destroyers, and aircraft, it must stay at home or risk destruction. Yet the vital interests of the United States may require the fleet to take the high seas.

There is only one fleet submarine under the American flag, and that one is not yet fitted for diving. It is a good boat and will be tested for diving in good time. The United States should have submarines capable of traveling with the Battle Fleet.

An inquiry should be made by Congress covering the present state of the Navy and its needs for the immediate future. The expenditure of large sums should not be made until Congress knows where the money should go, whether for submarines, airplanes, naval bases, or cruisers, or all of these.

Capable naval officers are at the disposition of Congress, ready to give full and accurate information upon which Congress can safely act. Let them be summoned. They can not speak until they are required to speak. The information they possess is useless unless it is passed along to Congress. Congress is sure to make a mistake if it appropriates money without possessing proper information. The modernization of the Navy to make it an effective arm of national defense is a step that should not be delayed. The lessons taught by the late war should be applied. The General Board and the Secretary of the Navy can not apply them. Only Congress can do that, and it can not do it without first learning the present condition of the Navy and what is needed to bring it up to date.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I hoped that the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs would feel the necessity of favorable action upon my resolutions. He has exhibited interest in the Navy; but I think his interest would have been emphasized if he had joined in demanding the investigation called for.

At a later date, Mr. President, I shall address the Senate upon our naval policy and call attention to many matters which I think the Senate should know. If the resolutions which I offered are adopted and hearings are had upon them, the facts will then be elicited, and, when legislation based upon the information obtained is presented, the entire subject can be properly canvassed and the Senate and the country advised as to the condition of our Navy and its imperative needs.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I can promise the Senator from Utah that his resolution of the last session and the resolution which he has recently introduced, which I understand has not

yet been referred to the Naval Affairs Committee, will both receive every consideration when they come before the committee for action. If the committee determines that a general investigation of the Navy is proper and is necessary I can promise the Senator from Utah that he will have it. On the other hand, as to certain allegations which are made in his resolution, if he can show that there is ground to believe that they are actual facts, I can promise him that he will have an investigation of those allegations and that he will have fair treatment in every way.

Now, Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Utah to reconsider the vote by which House bill 8687 was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine moves to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill which he has named was passed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Those in favor of the motion will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no." The ayes have it, and the motion is laid on the table.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I rose and addressed the Chair before the question was put, but the President pro tempore did not hear me.

This may be the way to shut off debate in the Senate. It may be that this is the course we are entering on, for some Senator to get on the floor and say all that he has to say and then deprive other Senators of an opportunity to say anything in reply by making a motion to lay on the table a motion which has been made to reconsider. That, however, has not been the general practice of the Senate.

A motion to reconsider is an important one and debate on it should not be shut off in this manner. I have had no opportunity to study the question myself, but I was listening here with a great deal of interest to the statement of the Senator from Utah, who has given the subject consideration, and then I listened to the reply, and I heard the Senator from Maine say in reply that if his committee saw fit to report favorably on the resolution they would so report, and if they saw fit to report otherwise they would so report. That was a very convincing and enlightening statement to all of us, I am sure, because we now know exactly what the committee is going to do.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator think that I could answer for the committee?

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well. The Senator undertook to answer in some way and to give some assurance, and his assurance was that if the committee saw fit to report favorably they would do so and if they saw fit to report unfavorably they would do so, whereupon he moved to lay the motion on the table. That is a legislative syllogism which is somewhat unique.

Mr. HALE. I think, Mr. President, if the Senator listened to what I said he would recall that I said we would give the Senator from Utah every chance to put his case before the committee and would hear him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, I am coming to that. Then the Senator said that there were certain questions of fact which the resolution asks to have investigated, and here he took very high ground. It was that if the Senator from Utah would appear in advance and prove the allegations, then the committee would proceed to investigate whether they were true or not; in other words, the Senator from Utah is required to possess the information in advance and the evidence in advance which it is his very purpose under the resolution to ask the committee to ascertain. Of course, if the Senator from Utah had the evidence in advance he would not need any investigation; he would not need any committee to ascertain whether the evidence existed or not because he would already have it, and if he had the evidence it would be quite as effective as though it had been ascertained by a committee.

Mr. President, the motion to lay on the table was adopted without any proper consideration, and I suppose that is a finality to this bill. I undertook to address the Chair, but was unsuccessful in attracting the attention of the President of the Senate. I protest against this sort of proceeding in the Senate—a Senator rising to make a speech and saying all he has to say, and then moving immediately to cut off everybody else from the opportunity of saying a word.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri knows that the Senator from Alabama told me he would not object to my request for unanimous consent, provided I could get action within a reasonably short time.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But that does not mean that the Senator should foreclose the matter if the debate was taking more than a reasonable time.

Mr. HALE. This is not an ordinary bill, Mr. President. This is a bill that has already been acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. REED of Missouri. And a motion was made in the closing days of the last session to reconsider, and that motion came over to this session. If the Senator felt that he was bound not to interfere with the Senator from Alabama in the progress of the measure in which that Senator is so much interested if the debate took longer than would be fair to the Senator from Alabama, all that was necessary to do was to lay this question over until to-morrow, and not to make a motion which would foreclose all debate and future consideration. The excuse of the Senator is just as lame as the logic he employed in defending his action.

Mr. HALE. I have already explained to the Senator that we are trying to get action on the matter as soon as possible in order that the Budget may make the supplemental estimate and present it to the Appropriations Committee, so that we may take the matter up in the naval appropriation bill which will shortly be considered.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Well, we have the entire session before us. We will not gain any time by this sort of method—not a bit of it.

#### MUSCLE SHOALS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 518) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War, for national defense in time of war and for the production of fertilizers and other useful products in time of peace, to sell to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, nitrate plant No. 1, at Sheffield, Ala.; nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Waco Quarry, near Russellville, Ala.; steam power plant to be located and constructed at or near Lock and Dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., with right of way and transmission line to nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; and to lease to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 (as designated in H. Doc. 1262, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), including power stations when constructed as provided herein, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, may I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STERLING in the chair). House bill 518 is before the Senate, and the pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

#### DEBTS OF THE ALLIED NATIONS

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, because it may have escaped the notice of Senators, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to what I regard as a very serious question. I hope it will receive thoughtful attention, particularly from the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It ought also to receive the thoughtful attention of every commission and every person endeavoring to collect our foreign debts.

I read in the Washington Post of this morning these headlines:

Britain to demand creditors pay her in reimbursing United States—Proportionate payments to be asked, Churchill tells Commons—Surprise in Capital over announcement—Difficulties are foreseen in trying to effect refunding of remaining debts.

The article which follows is, in part, as I shall read:

Winston Churchill, Chancellor of the Exchequer, alluding in the House of Commons to-day to the Franco-American war debt conversations, said the Government would consider it essential that any payments made by Great Britain's debtors in Europe to their creditors in the United States should be accompanied simultaneously by proportionate payments to Great Britain.

In examining what is printed—and I have no doubt correctly—as the text of Mr. Churchill's address, it appears that he discussed the sacrifices that England had made, the burdens the English taxpayer had undergone, and referred to the fact that England had settled with the United States. I do not want to misconstrue his words, but I think it fair to say he at least expressed doubt as to Great Britain's wisdom in making that settlement. He included in his statement these remarks:

Having met all our liabilities as prescribed, having rigorously discharged every contract into which we have entered, we are entitled to rest ourselves with confidence upon the position of freedom and independence which we have regained. We have regained it not without great sacrifice, but it is ours and it is ours forever. [Cheers.] We can look everyone in the face.

This debt settlement was unquestionably the indispensable forerunner of the consolidation and increasing establishment of our credit



throughout the world, on which our world-wide trade depends, and it is the essential foundation in all improvement in exchange between this country and the United States and the maintenance of exchange, which is a vital factor in the whole of our national and international finance.

What is the second great factor in the problem, so far as we in this country are concerned? It is the Balfour note. That note was drawn up three years ago. Associated as it is with the name of a statesman revered throughout Europe, it must in British eyes play a most important part in our future discussions on this subject.

The Balfour note was published before the settlement of the American debt was effected, but we had already been invited by the United States to enter into negotiations for funding of the debt.

What was the principle of Balfour's note? It was that we would obliterate and delete all debts owing to us if we were similarly treated by others in respect of debts owing to them, but it also said that if that was impossible we should ask as much, and no more, from Europe than the United States might find it necessary to require from us. That was the principle expressed in the Balfour note at that date.

Now, a word of comment:

The principle of Balfour's note \* \* \* was that we would obliterate and delete all debts owing to us if we were similarly treated by others.

That is to say, England would forgive France her debts if France would forgive her debtors and if we would forgive England her debt to us. In other words, it was a method of payment every dollar of which came out of the Treasury of the United States. If England owed us four or five billion dollars and we forgave England, of course England could forgive four or five billion dollars of other debts and not be out a cent. In turn every other nation along the line could forgive its debtors and not be out a cent. But how about the United States? We would be the great paymaster then, as we have been in the past. We would cancel the ultimate debt. We would pay all of the debt ourselves.

That was the Balfour note. That is the spirit of it, as repeated here by Mr. Churchill. It is still sticking in the craw of English statesmen and of other European statesmen.

We thought we had eliminated that notion when we made a contract with England which was not the contract England made with us during the war. Her contract with us then plainly stated that upon the receipt of the moneys of this Government she would issue to this Government bonds in terms of interest and in terms of payment exactly similar to the bonds we were obliged to issue when we borrowed these moneys from our people. Subsequently, without authority of law, the Secretary of the Treasury turned over this money to European countries without demanding and receiving their bonds, because it was alleged that the exigencies of the case were so great that time could not be taken to carry out formally the terms of the statute, which directed the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out the money only upon receipt of the bonds. Accordingly, when the money was turned over in lieu of the bonds, he took a solemn written obligation by which each of the European powers obtaining money—including, of course, Great Britain—was, upon demand, to issue to us the kind and character of bonds required by our statute; and at that time an agreement was made for the payment of 5 per cent interest. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] will set me right if I am in error about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Five per cent was the rate.

Mr. REED of Missouri. But whether that 5 per cent was meant to be a temporary interest until the bonds were issued, or whether it was to run for the entire term of the bonds and was a modification of that clause of our statute which provided that the bonds to be given to us should bear the same rate of interest as our bonds, this much is true, that the language of the contract expressly bound Great Britain to give us bonds at least of the same kind and character as the bonds we had issued to our people. The whole thought when we passed the statute and when the contract was made was that the English obligation to us should take care of our obligation to the American people who had bought these bonds, so that we never would be obliged to levy a dollar of tax to pay either the interest or the principal of those bonds. We would receive that money from Great Britain and the other powers in time to meet these obligations.

We borrowed this money at an expense of probably  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent initially. It may well be said that our loans cost us  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Nevertheless, when we came to settle with Great Britain, she did not settle with us on the terms written in the contract she had given us. She held off. She made it difficult, and finally, in order to get a settlement, a committee rep-

resenting this Government agreed with her to fix the time of the payment of her loan, not according to the time our bonds matured but extended the time for ultimate payment to 62 years. Moreover, we gave her the money for a period of years at 3 per cent. I will ask the Senator from Utah for how many years that was.

Mr. SMOOT. For 10 years.

Mr. REED of Missouri. For 10 years, at 3 per cent. During those 10 years we are paying 4 and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent for the same money we loaned to Great Britain. That is substantially a correct statement; there may be a variation of a quarter of a per cent. After the 10 years the interest she pays is equivalent to what rate? I will again inquire of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Three and a half per cent for 52 years.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Three and a half per cent for 52 years; and yet our obligations, as long as they run, compel us to pay 4 and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The difference between the rate of interest which we are now paying and the rate of interest which Great Britain pays us, compounded for the 62 years, is about \$22,000,000. It runs to that astounding figure when the interest is compounded, and it is proper to compound the interest, for we are laying out the interest money, and if we collected it we could loan it out at interest.

That is the way Great Britain met her obligations. At the time the settlement was proposed I opposed it upon this floor because I thought it unfair to the United States. Yet I am free to say that in view of the attitude of Great Britain, as manifested by Mr. Churchill in this debate of yesterday, it occurs to me that perhaps the committee were fortunate in getting a settlement at all. I desire, however, to say nothing harsh on this question. I simply wish to call attention to the cold facts.

During the war, Mr. President, upon the floor of the Senate a committee representing the British Government was received, and I heard one of her great men say to the Senate, "If you are coming, come quickly." That was a tremendous thing for a Briton to say. A Briton does not call for help until he needs it, for I pay the British nation the compliment of saying that it is the gamest nation there is in the world, always, we hope, excepting ourselves. An Englishman never calls for help until he needs it, and needs it very badly. This was the cry, the Macedonian cry, "Come over and help us, and come quickly with your men and your money."

So Great Britain, and so these other nations, not only called for men, but they called for money, and, while I do not wish to criticize him at all, the Secretary of our Treasury technically violated the mandate of the statute when he gave them that money before he received the bonds. If he had received the bonds, they would have been in the Treasury of the United States to-day, or in circulation, and this controversy would not be before us. Yet I do not speak of that to criticize the Secretary of the Treasury, because we were in a war, and we were doing many things in an irregular way.

So we called upon our people to buy those bonds, to buy until it hurt, to bleed themselves white; and they did buy until it hurt, and we gave that money to France and to England and to other countries in the hour of their dire distress, and we gave it upon their faith and credit as honorable nations. They had been in the war before we were. The war was not of our seeking or our making. It was because of the depredations which occurred in that war that we were compelled finally to enter in order to protect our commerce. There was not, in my judgment, a minute from the time the United States entered that war until its close that Germany would not have made peace with us separately and agreed to any reasonable conditions we would have named. I do not claim that correspondence or contemporary records manifest this, but it was the logic of the situation. We entered that war and stepped into the ranks alongside these European countries. We entered it for a less cause than they had, who were fighting for their lives, while we were merely vindicating our honor. We said to them, "We will stay with you until a peace is made that is satisfactory to you. We will not make a separate peace." And we did stay with them. Without detracting one iota from the gallantry of their soldiers, from the valor of their people, from the magnificent fight they put up, it is a matter history will record that if the United States had not entered that war in all human probability the peace would have been signed in Paris. It would have been a German peace, and not a French and English and Belgian peace.

We gave this money; we gave these men. We gave our own men for our own efforts. We equipped our own men. That war cost America not less than \$50,000,000,000 all told. But



of the money we raised, we raised something like \$11,000,000,000 not for ourselves but for them. When we come to ask for the payment we are meeting with continued opposition.

France and England and Belgium had been copartners in that war. Every dollar we loaned to Belgium aided England. Every dollar we loaned to France aided Belgium. Every dollar we loaned to England aided all of her allies. So we loaned to each of them in proportion to their wants. But it was this influx of money and the material it bought that stiffened their lines. It was the shortening of their lines by filling in the spaces thus left with American soldiers which made it possible to win the war. Otherwise, no matter how the war might have ultimately ended, certain it is that the damage that would have been done to England and to France if it had continued without our intervention would have been so horrible that the amount of money we loaned them would be a mere bagatelle compared with the financial loss.

Now, we have asked England for her settlement and obtained it. We went then to our separate creditor, France, and have asked for a settlement there. We have gone to these various countries. We have said to them, "We do not propose to be hard on you. We do not propose to play the game of the Shylock who demands the pound of flesh and whatever blood comes with it. We simply want you to agree to pay us sometime, and if you need extensions we will carry the loan. We will manage some way or other to tax our own people enough to keep up the interest upon the bonds and to finally meet them if you are unable at that time to pay your interest, and as the bonds mature to pay the principal. If you need more time, we will give it to you, and we will tax our people in order to do it. But as honest nations, as honorable nations, at least give us your promise to pay sometime."

When we go to France to ask for that money, a great English statesman, Mr. Churchill, after making the remark to which I have just adverted, after intimating, at least, that the Balfour scheme of cancellation of debts is still in mind and that America ought to be the final paymaster—for that is the logic of the situation—adds:

There is one new aspect which has been brought into prominence lately. I mean the negotiations which we read in the newspapers have taken place between France and the United States for adjustment of Franco-American debts.

As far as His Majesty's Government understand, there are no formal negotiations in progress, but there have been tentative inquiries and conversations. The matter has not advanced farther than that at the present time, so far as we know. There is, therefore, no necessity for any formal declaration on our part in regard to this matter at this moment.

Speaking generally, I would venture to say that we do not wish to hinder any arrangement for mutual benefit which may be entered into between two friendly nations allied and associated with us in the Great War.

We consider it essential, however, that any payments made by our debtors in Europe to their creditors in the United States should be accompanied simultaneously and *pari passu* by proportionate payments to Britain. [Cheers.]

That indicates the general scope and outline of the policy which His Majesty's Government will endeavor to pursue in regard to interallied debts in the months and, I trust, in the years which lie immediately before us; and I also say that in pursuing that policy we shall be animated by a spirit of warmest comradeship toward our friends and allies in the war, and we shall sedulously avoid the use of any language or indulgence of any mood which would possibly be the cause of offense or lead to disturbance of the harmony which has existed.

Soft words at the end, soft words at the beginning of this paragraph, but the meat of it is that when we go to France and ask France to pay us, Great Britain proposes to interpose her powerful influence and say, "You must not pay America unless you pay us at the same time. We will insist upon that." And thus they interfere with us in making an independent bargain for the collection of our debt from that debtor who stood beside England in the war, by that debtor who was aided by these funds—for every dollar thus yielded to that debtor benefited Great Britain and helped her maintain the struggle.

Now, Mr. President, in my humble judgment it is the high duty of this Government to maintain friendly and cordial relations with all the nations of the world. It is our duty to go to the extreme limit in order that we may produce good feeling for America in every court and every country of the world. But I assert that any interference on the part of Great Britain, directly or indirectly, with the business of this country and France in the settlement of our particular claims against that particular country is a thing that can not be tolerated for a moment. When I undertake to collect my just debts from my

debtor and another man insists that that debtor shall not pay me unless at the same time he pays to him a given sum of money, that is an interference with my right of collection; it is an interference in my business.

This great Nation can not afford to tolerate any such interference by Great Britain or by any other country on earth. It is our business to proceed as we see fit. If England has a claim against France, as she undoubtedly has, let her proceed in her own way to make her own bargain. We will not interfere with France in paying Great Britain. We have never sought to do that; and so we can not tolerate any interference by Great Britain with France if France shall desire to pay us. Such interference, such attempted overlordship of the world, is as intolerable as was the act of the Kaiser when he told the American Nation that it could sail its vessels in certain lanes provided we repainted them in certain colors.

I have felt that this matter ought to be called to the attention of the Senate. I repeat that it would be well for Great Britain, if she desires to retain the good will of this country, that her statesmen should understand that if they have business with France they should proceed to transact that business with France and we will not interfere, but that in so far as we have business with France we will proceed to its transactions and we will tolerate no interference by any power of earth.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think it, perhaps, a proper occasion to notify the Senate and the people of the country that the Foreign War Debt Funding Commission have no intention, and never has had any intention or even inclination, to agree to cancel any debt owing to the United States by any country in all the world.

Mr. OVERMAN. Would the commission have any power to cancel any debt?

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, they would not without the action of Congress, and they have no intention of ever asking Congress to do it.

Another thing, Mr. President. I notice by clippings from the English press that the statement has been made that there was an agreement, not in writing but a verbal agreement between the representatives of the British Empire and the members of the United States Debt Funding Commission, that if there were any more liberal terms granted to any other country in the settlement of the obligations owing by that country to the United States, the same terms of settlement would be granted later to England. I want to say, Mr. President, that there was never such an agreement or understanding. On the contrary, that proposition was discussed by the representatives of England with the Debt Commission and the request was made of the commission to incorporate it in the terms that would be recommended to Congress for ratification, but it never was agreed to.

Not a member of the commission ever even intimated that such an agreement would be acceptable to the commission or to Congress or to the American people. In the settlement made with England there are no strings attached. Every understanding is included in the agreement itself, and the terms of the settlement are published just as they are, and there is no understanding other than is in the written word.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me at that point?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Missouri. In order that it may appear in the RECORD, if the commission had undertaken to do anything of that kind it would have been absolutely void unless it was written in the instrument, because in the last analysis the Congress acts only on the written proposal brought to it and has no knowledge of anything outside of that proposal.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator has made the statement correctly. Not only that, but I want to say there was no understanding that any such proposal in the future should be made other than contained in the terms of the settlement as set forth in the written contract.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri asked the question which I rose to ask, but he made it stronger. As I understand the situation it is that the commission had no authority to make the settlement which was subsequently made with Great Britain by an act of Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. All the authority they had was to recommend an agreement reached to the Congress of the United States for ratification, and that was done.

Mr. SWANSON. And all that is contained in any settlement or understanding made with Great Britain or the British



Government was submitted to the Congress and ratified by a vote of the Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. Every item. There is no contract or agreement between the two countries other than is contained in the settlement that was ratified by Congress and signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am glad the Senator made the statement, not because it is necessary from anything that I said, but I am glad to have it put in the Record at this time, so that at least the American people and such of the British people as pay us the compliment of following our proceedings may be advised of the declaration and of the facts.

#### MUSCLE SHOALS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 518) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War, for national defense in time of war and for the production of fertilizers and other useful products in time of peace, to sell to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, nitrate plant No. 1, at Sheffield, Ala.; nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Waco Quarry, near Russellville, Ala.; steam power plant to be located and constructed at or near Lock and Dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., with right of way and transmission line to nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; and to lease to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 (as designated in H. Doc. 1262, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), including power stations when constructed as provided herein, and for other purposes.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, as tending to show the attitude of the country toward the pending measure, there is a powerful and informative editorial in the New York World of this morning which I wish to read into the Record. The title of the editorial is "Protect Muscle Shoals," and it reads as follows:

#### PROTECT MUSCLE SHOALS

If the Underwood Muscle Shoals bill comes to a vote in its present form, the World hopes that the Senate will vote it down.

If the bill passes and goes to the House, the World hopes that the House will amend it. This bill is wrong.

It is wrong because its authors insist upon treating the Shoals as a nitrate plant rather than a power source and thereafter fail to protect the public interest in that power. Muscle Shoals will never give the farmers of this country cheap fertilizer. It will never give the farmers cheap fertilizer—

First, because even the Underwood bill plans to produce only one-thirtieth of the nitrogen we annually import from Chile.

Second, because nitrogen itself is not a fertilizer—at best it is only 10 per cent of a fertilizer—it must be mixed with other chemicals.

Third, nothing that the Shoals can do with nitrogen—even if it produces 40,000,000 tons a year instead of 40,000—can affect in any way the prices of those other chemicals. The idea that the Shoals, producing one-thirtieth of one product which in itself is one-tenth of a fertilizer, can do anything miraculous for the farmers is mere nonsense.

The Shoals is not primarily a nitrate plant. The Shoals is a power station. Those three dams which have cost the country millions can be made to furnish 850,000 horsepower annually, the greatest single power resource in the United States capable of immediate development. This power the Underwood bill ignores, making no provision for its future use whatever. Not only that: On Tuesday Mr. UNDERWOOD persuaded the Senate to vote down an amendment of Senator McNARY's proposing that power development at the Shoals strictly conform with the regulation of the Federal water power act.

This is dangerous business. Muscle Shoals may easily become the central reservoir of electric power of all States east of the Mississippi and many west of it. It is inviting another Teapot Dome to leave that reservoir without every protection which intelligent law can throw around it, every protection carried in the water power act for control of rates, expropriation of excessive profits, minimum guarantee of power to be furnished, and penalties for licensees who do not market their developed energy on fair terms to the consumer.

The World does not believe that Senator UNDERWOOD and his colleagues wished to write a bill as dangerous as this one. It is a more likely explanation that as delegates of Southern States which consume more than half of the commercial fertilizer used in the country they have been swept along a little heedlessly by their interest in nitrates and their reverence for the farm propaganda put out in the magic name of Mr. Ford.

This is a better bill than Mr. Ford's. But it is a bill which puts the cart before the horse and then forgets the horse. Too much is at stake for that bill ever to be made a law.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, this is quite an illuminating editorial that has been read by the Senator from New

York [Mr. COPELAND]. Of course, on a great newspaper like the New York World they have all kinds and sorts of editorial writers. Really I am sorry that the person who wrote the very illuminating editorial did not attach his name to it, because without it reflection is cast upon those splendid editorial writers on the New York World who have made that newspaper one of the greatest in the country. Then he should have had his name attached to the editorial for the reason that it might show to the people just how ignorant some persons are who attempt to educate the public on a question which they know little or nothing about.

Of course, we are glad that the great New York World through this unknown editorial writer admits that the Underwood substitute is better than the Ford proposal. It places some of us in a very good position, because many of us favored the Ford offer; and if the pending proposition is better than the Ford proposal it is gratifying to us. So the substitute is really better than we thought it was when the proposition was first made by the Senator from Alabama.

Now, let us see what this great editorial writer, who is unknown except to the persons in the editorial rooms of that wonderful newspaper, says about this measure. When one attempts to educate the people and to give facts they ought to be real facts. Let us see.

Of course, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND] did not indorse this editorial and does not vouch for the alleged statement of facts. He has read the editorial, and rightfully so, because it appears in the editorial columns of a great newspaper of this country, a newspaper which has few equals in its influence upon American readers and the American public. So the Senator from New York has read the editorial merely for the information of the Senate. However, it reflects upon a great newspaper, discredits a real newspaper, and my good friend Herbert Swope ought to summon into his private office the editorial writer who wrote this piece of misinformation and "call him down" for writing on a subject about which he knows nothing, for if the New York World has done one thing above everything else it has been to try to speak the truth and to give the real facts about any controversy with which it was dealing in its editorial columns. So I look for Mr. Swope to summon before him the particular editorial novice who wrote this article and to give him a "panning" for writing on a subject about which he knows nothing.

I do not know where this writer got his information. He may have read the speeches of my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], or he may have been reading from the speeches of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], but certainly he has not been studying the record as it appears in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the House Committee on Agriculture. If he had read the illuminating articles which have been written and published in the Saturday Evening Post and the reports which have been filed in this Chamber by my friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LADD], who knows as much about this subject as does any man who graces the Senate Chamber, he would never have written such an editorial as this. He would at least have been straight on his facts. Now, let us see. This writer states that the Underwood bill should not pass, and he further states—

It is wrong because its authors insist upon treating the shoals as a nitrate plant rather than a power source, and thereafter fail to protect the public interest in that power.

If this unknown editorial writer had gone back to the original act which was passed in May, 1916, which sought to locate the dams and to erect the power plants, he would have found that the intention of the American Congress was and that the idea of the Democratic administration at that time was to construct those dams and erect those plants first, to develop power to make nitrogen for war purposes, and second, in times of peace to make nitrogen for fertilizer purposes. In my feeble way I tried some days ago, following a discussion of the subject by my friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], to read from that statute, enacted in 1916, which expressly provides that this development shall be undertaken in order to make fertilizer for the agricultural interests of the country. If this unknown editorial novice had read the message of the distinguished President of the United States, he would have seen that the intention of this administration is not to change the policy adopted by the prior administration or the intent of Congress at that time to do something for the great agricultural interests of the country.

There is no authorization, so far as the present law is concerned, to develop Muscle Shoals for the sale of power and



power alone, but it must be incident to the manufacture of nitrates for war purposes and nitrates for fertilizer purposes. So, in the very beginning of this remarkable editorial, we find that the editorial writer is flying in the face of the law when he states that the Underwood substitute is all wrong because it seeks to develop this plant for fertilizer purposes while it should be developed for the sale of power.

Let us go further into this remarkable editorial. The writer says:

It will never give the farmer cheap fertilizer.

Why? The writer says:

First, because even the Underwood bill plans to produce only one-thirtieth of the nitrogen we annually import from Chile.

That is a remarkable statement for one who graces the editorial sanctum sanctorum of a great newspaper, that the plant developed at Muscle Shoals can not produce over one-thirtieth of the nitrogen imported annually from Chile. If he had studied the record and knew anything about the facts he would know that the development at Muscle Shoals will produce annually anywhere from one-fifth to one-sixth of the amount of nitrogen that is imported from Chile every year, and not one-thirtieth. I do not know where he got his facts. He was not reading the speeches of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] or the speeches of my friend from Nebraska [Mr. Norris], because in the wildest flights of their imagination they never went so far as to say that there could only be manufactured at Muscle Shoals one-thirtieth of the amount of nitrates that we import annually from Chile.

According to my figures—and if I am incorrect I will ask my friend from Alabama to correct me—we import annually from Chile about 900,000 tons of Chilean nitrates. The 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen that will be produced at Muscle Shoals will be equivalent to 250,000 tons of the Chilean nitrates which come in. Figuring that out, it shows that we will produce at Muscle Shoals when we reach the maximum 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, or about one-fifth or one-sixth of the amount that is imported from Chile every year. Yet this great newspaper, through its editorial columns, in an editorial written by a novice who is supposed to be there to educate and lead the people along right lines, is wrong to a very great extent in that first proposition which he lays down.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOSES in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield gladly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. So that the Senator may accurately educate the gentleman about whom he is talking I should be very glad to put the actual facts into the Record at this point.

Mr. HARRISON. I will be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of Chilean nitrates in the year 1923 there were imported into this country 894,529 tons. That amount of importations was equal to 144,000 tons of pure fixed nitrogen. The production of coke-oven ammonia amounted to 458,000 tons, or 95,300 tons of pure nitrogen. The two added together make a total of 239,300 tons of pure nitrogen.

The plant at Muscle Shoals is to produce 40,000 tons of nitrogen, which is one-sixth instead of being one-thirtieth, of the importations. In fact, if the importations of Chilean nitrates were thirty times more than the capacity of the plant at Muscle Shoals, they would amount to one-half of all the nitrates we have imported from Chile since we began such importations in 1831. Down to the year 1923 the total importations from Chile were only 16,370,258 tons, whereas if the ideas of this gentleman were carried out and the importations were thirty times greater than the quantity of nitrogen to be produced at Muscle Shoals we would be importing over 7,500,000 tons a year from Chile. Of course, as my friend the Senator from Mississippi says, the figures are simply absurd in their enormity.

Mr. HARRISON. Then, too, on every ton of the nitrates imported from Chile, amounting to nearly 900,000 tons annually, the farmers of America have to pay \$12.53 a ton export duty to the Chilean Government. That is what that Government exacts on nitrates that are exported to the United States. That is an enormous figure, indeed, and yet this editorial writer says that the enactment of the pending proposal can not affect the prices of fertilizer to the American farmer,

Let us see further what the editorial says:

Second, because nitrogen itself is not a fertilizer—at best it is only 10 per cent of a fertilizer—it must be mixed with other chemicals.

I suppose if we wanted to find an expert on fertilizers or on nitrogen we would not particularly go to the great metropolis of New York; but certainly I presume if that city were searched with a fine-tooth comb there could not be found in it one so ignorant as to say that nitrogen is not a particular kind of fertilizer. Certain kinds of soil demand nitrogen just the same as other kinds of soil may demand potash or phosphoric acid. So, if this unknown editorial writer has done nothing more he has certainly shown his ignorance with respect to the fertilizers that are required and are produced in this country.

Let us see further. He says, in this editorial:

Third, nothing that the Shoals can do with nitrogen—even if it produces 40,000,000 tons a year instead of 40,000—can affect in any way the prices of those other chemicals.

A remarkable statement! The less the nitrogen costs, the more the farmer can pay for the other ingredients that go into the fertilizer; and yet this unknown editorial writer says it could not affect the prices of the other ingredients that go into the different kinds of fertilizer!

Let us go further:

The Shoals is not primarily a nitrate plant. The Shoals is a power station.

Evidently this unknown editorial writer wants to create a great power station, so that power and power alone, and not fertilizer, can be sold to that section of the country. He says:

Those three dams which have cost the country millions can be made to furnish 850,000 horsepower annually.

Why, there is now completed but one dam—Dam No. 1. That develops no power at all. It was not constructed for power purposes. Dam No. 2 will not be completed until July of next year. As shown by the map there, after the completion of Dam No. 3—which has not yet been authorized by the law, and which no one thinks can be completed for at least five years, although this remarkable editorial writer, whose name is unknown, writes as though it had been completed—I say, this chart shows that even from Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 they can only develop, of primary horsepower, 241,000 annually. That is based on the acquisition of 120,000 steam power. Yet this editorial writer says that they are developing, from these three dams that cost millions, 850,000 horsepower; and then he says:

Of course that will gobble up all the power in that section, and none will be left.

Why, Mr. President, judging from the surveys that have been made and the evidence that appeared before the Agricultural Committee, in the section of country south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi there is susceptible of being developed 8,000,000 installed horsepower. At Muscle Shoals the total of primary and secondary horsepower is only about 850,000—only about one-eighth or one-tenth that that great section is susceptible of developing. So I hope that the particular writer of this great newspaper—and I apologize to its management for even having to take issue with an editorial—will be called in and called down for trying to mislead the American people by certain statements that are not substantiated by the facts, and that they will print another editorial based on facts. The New York World has never tried to mislead. It is a great newspaper, and I am sorry to see that editorial appearing in its columns.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has so clearly and forcefully answered the statement, or alleged statement, or attempted statement in the editorial of the New York World that it is not necessary for me to say anything, except that I regret, when an effort is being made here to secure a nitrate supply for the defense of the country, that a great paper in the great metropolis of the Nation—the point where attack from an enemy might and probably would come first—entirely ignores the fact that we are without a powder supply unless this plant is developed.

My friend from New York introduced this editorial merely, as he said, to show the sentiment of the country. I have here a letter that also shows the sentiment of the country westward from New York, and I ask to have it read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.



The reading clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
Washington, D. C., December 9, 1924.

HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: For five years the American Farm Bureau Federation has sought a solution to the question presented in the operation of the nitrate plant and water-power development at Muscle Shoals, Ala. If the air-nitrogen industry is to be established in the United States, this question must be settled.

Our position is that this property can best serve the public if maintained in operating condition for the production of explosives in time of war and used in the service of agriculture for the production of nitrogen and other fertilizer materials, these to be combined into high-grade compounds. To secure this result we have advocated private operation and earnestly supported the acceptance of the proposal made by Mr. Henry Ford to take over this property. This offer has now been withdrawn, due to the failure of the United States Senate to accept it.

In order that a decision may be reached as promptly as possible, we have considered the various solutions presented by the bills before the Senate, and believe that the principles outlined in the Underwood bill would form a basis upon which a settlement can be reached. It is our purpose to support private operation if a proposal embodying the main principles of the Ford offer can be secured. If not, we will support the alternative presented in the Underwood bill—that is, Government operation.

With this statement of the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation, we ask that you give your support to the Underwood bill to secure its early passage.

Very truly yours,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,  
E. B. REID,  
Acting Washington Representative.

Mr. HEFLIN and Mr. COPELAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, in line with what has been said by my friend the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], I desire to submit a few remarks to the Senate.

This mysterious expert from New York who has written the editorial to which reference has been made, knows about as much about fertilizer as did the farm demonstration agent from New York who was sent down by the Agricultural Department into the Southern States to report on conditions in the cotton crop. Those who are familiar with the cotton plant know that when the blossom first appears it is snow white, and that in two or three days it is rosy red, and then finally fades and falls, having done its work in producing the little boll which appears when the blossom falls. This expert, who knew as much about cotton as this writer in the New York World knew about the making of fertilizer at Muscle Shoals, was sent down into the State of Oklahoma to report on cotton prospects in that section. He came back and, when asked what he thought of the situation, said that he believed the red-blossom variety of cotton was better adapted to Oklahoma than the white-blossom variety, and I think he was promoted for his knowledge upon the subject. [Laughter.] So this gentleman who wrote this editorial that has been read to us knows nearly as much about fertilizer as this field agent knew about cotton blossoms in the land of Dixie.

Mr. President, it may be that this writer represents the same interests that rejoiced when Ford withdrew his offer. I want to read to the Senate a statement from the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Wall Street Journal, October 22, 1924]

CHILEAN NITRATE OUTLOOK—FORD'S WITHDRAWAL OF MUSCLE SHOALS OFFER RESULTS IN ROOM TO CHILEAN INDUSTRY

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—Henry Ford's withdrawal of his offer to take over the Muscle Shoals project has resulted in a considerable boom in the Chilean nitrate industry. Chile is the greatest nitrate producer in the world, and the United States is her principal customer. With Ford in control of Muscle Shoals on an announced program of making vast quantities of nitrate from the air, Chilean producers saw ruin ahead of them. Nitrate shares in London rose from two to three points as soon as news of withdrawal of the Ford offer was received.

Mr. President, the Chilean people of course rejoiced when Henry Ford withdrew his offer. They knew that he would reduce the price of fertilizer about half. They knew that the supply of Chilean nitrates coming into the United States would be cut in two. They feared the acceptance of the Ford offer; and the interests that were working with Chile right here in the United States rejoiced with Chile when Mr. Ford withdrew his offer. This statement tells the tale.

Why, the stocks in the Chilean nitrate industry went up immediately when Ford withdrew his offer. The pendency of the Ford offer had a depressing effect upon the Chilean industry. Those who owned and operated it were disturbed. Why? Because in the United States the Government was about to establish a nitrate plant that would be in strong competition with Chile; and yet we have heard in this Chamber from day to day, from men some of whom are nearly as well informed as the editorial writer in the World, that it is a matter of doubt as to whether nitrates can be produced at a profit at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. President, that position is utterly ridiculous. Why, the testimony throughout the hearings we had before the Agricultural Committee sustained the contention I have made from the outset in this body, that we can make it for about half the price for which it now sells. I want to read a statement from Mr. Callan, one of the expert witnesses before our committee. He said:

At Muscle Shoals, if our process were installed, with horsepower at what is supposed to be cost, you could produce ammonia in the neighborhood of 5 cents per pound, or perhaps less, by this process and by making the hydrogen by the use of power or in an electrolytic-cell plant.

I asked him:

A little while ago you stated that this fertilizer ingredient that you sold for 12 cents and as high as 30 cents could be made for less than 10 cents. Is that right?

Mr. CALLAN. Anhydrous ammonia can be made for less than 10 cents per pound, synthetically, when you have no cost for hydrogen.

Then I asked:

What do you figure this could be made at Muscle Shoals for?

Mr. CALLAN. Fertilizer ammonia can be made at Muscle Shoals by this process for something in the neighborhood of 5 cents per pound for the ammonia.

At what price is it selling now? The testimony before the committee was that the selling price was about 30 cents. Yet some Senators seem to doubt that fertilizers can be made at a profit at Muscle Shoals. I do not know how they get their impression, in the face of this testimony.

Then I said:

Mr. Mayo, who represents Mr. Ford, in the hearings here several years ago—two years, probably, since we have been having these hearings on the Muscle Shoals matter—said they thought they could produce fertilizer down there at about half the cost of the price it was selling for. Do you agree to that?

Mr. CALLAN. I agree that you can produce ammonia at Muscle Shoals at perhaps half the cost of its selling price at present, as ammonia is selling, for example, in sulphate of ammonia.

Mr. Callan agreed that you can produce ammonia at Muscle Shoals at perhaps half the price at which it is selling now.

Mr. President, we know that there are quite a number of fertilizer companies in the United States. We also know, according to the report of the Federal Trade Commission, that seven of the big fertilizer companies fix the price. They constitute a trust. We have a Fertilizer Trust in the United States, and this plant established at Muscle Shoals will do more to educate the people upon the cost of the manufacture of fertilizer than anything that we can do. If you can teach the people by the operation of this plant at Muscle Shoals that fertilizer can be produced there at a very much lower figure than the price at which it is being sold for to-day by the companies in the various States, they are going to ask for a reduction in price, and the amount of 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, mixed into commercial fertilizer, will have a tremendous effect in bringing down the price. There is no doubt about that.

The other day I read to the Senate what I want to refer to again in this connection. Mr. Waldo, testifying before our committee, said:

We do not claim that he [Mr. Ford] guarantees to cut the price of fertilizer in half. We say it is a reasonable expectation.

Then the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], said:

It is a reasonable expectation, no matter who gets it. I think it is fair to assume that we are going to cut the price of fertilizer in two in some way.

Mr. President, the chairman of that committee was evidently convinced at that time that this was what was going to happen down at Muscle Shoals.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator from Alabama will allow me, as he is discussing at this time the probable cost, just the other day there was in my office Doctor Whitney, the Chief of the Bureau of Soils, who has to do with the practical application of chemistry to the soil, and has perhaps taken as great an interest in this matter as any man in the employ of the Government, and if the Senator will allow me, I will just read a letter right at this point which he has written me.

Mr. HEFLIN. I shall be glad to have the Senator do that.

Mr. SMITH. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: In compliance with your request for information regarding the cost of nitrogen in the present commercial forms and the estimated cost under the proposed nitrogen-fixation methods I beg to state that you will find this discussed in the Muscle Shoals hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, part 6, on pages 1357 and 1359, and also regarding potash on page 1354. You will see that, based on the prices quoted, the ammonia costs about 12 cents a pound in the present commercial products, and it is estimated to be produced at around 6 cents a pound at Muscle Shoals. My testimony before this committee I think you will find covers very much the subject as we discussed it to-day.

Mr. HEFLIN. That bears out what I have been saying about reducing the price of fertilizers at Muscle Shoals. Mr. President, that goes to show why all these companies which are fighting the operation of a plant established at Muscle Shoals for the purpose of making fertilizer are afraid of this proposition. Why are they afraid of it? They do not want the truth known as to how cheaply fertilizer can be produced in the United States. The farmers of America are being literally held up by the Fertilizer Trust. They ought to be delivered from its clutches. This Muscle Shoals proposition will do it. Yet we are met on every hand with misinformation to the effect that it is very doubtful whether fertilizer can be made at Muscle Shoals. The fact that there is opposition by the Fertilizer Trust to this movement is proof positive that it can be done. They know it can be done, and they do not want it done. This New York editorial writer seems to have let the cat out of the bag when he said that the Muscle Shoals project ought to be used for power purposes. Of course that is what the Fertilizer Trust would like to have it used for. But we want to use it to make fertilizer, to make nitrates for military purposes in time of war and for fertilizers in time of peace.

I want to bring this thought to the attention of the Senate. As the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] said, we are paying millions every year for nitrates to Chile. It amounts to about \$12,000,000 per year, and every 11 years we pay to Chile the whole cost of the Muscle Shoals project—power plant, locks, dams, and all. Just multiply that amount by 11 and you have what we pay to Chile every 11 years, which is more than the entire cost of all that we have done at Muscle Shoals. That is what you are giving away to a foreign Government, and you are leaving this Government helpless in the hands of a foreign country in time of war. If a foreign enemy should seek to invade our country and we should cry out to Chile to let us have the nitrates needed in a hurry, Chile might say, "Why, we are going to be neutral in this matter."

"We are not going to let you have nitrates. It would be considered an unfriendly or hostile act by our friend, your enemy, and therefore we can not supply you." Shall we be caught napping in the face of such a contingency? Here we would be up in the air, then, with no operating nitrate plant of our own, and then Senators who have opposed this project would wake up and say, "We were wrong in our position in that matter."

Mr. President, Mr. Hooker, of New York, one of those who put in a bid for the Muscle Shoals project, testified that fertilizer could be made at about half the price for which it is selling at present, and my recollection is that every expert witness before the committee, or practically every one, representing these companies on the outside testified that they could do what Mr. Ford said he could do. That was not true in the outset, I will say to the Senate. In the outset we were showing that Ford was going to do this remarkable thing, that he was going to make fertilizer at half price at Muscle Shoals, and they all said then that it could not be done. But later on, when they saw that it looked as if Ford were going to get Muscle Shoals and they knew he would make good and produce fertilizer at half price, they came in and said, "We will just make a clean breast of it all. Of course it can be made at half price, using the water power at Muscle Shoals."

So now we have brought them to that point, and nobody except some Senator here denies that fertilizer can be made and sold at a profit at Muscle Shoals, and I am glad my colleague accepted the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska which compels the making of fertilizer, not leaving in the phrases "if practicable" and "upon demand." Of course there will be demand. In his speech the other day the Senator from Nebraska said, "We have not half enough fertilizer in the United States now," and I agree with him. He said, "If we had twice as much, and the price were reduced, there would be a great deal more used," and I agree with him again.

Why not do something here now which will bring down the price of fertilizer to the farmers of the United States? We can do it. Here is a step in that direction at least, and why not take that step?

I was wholeheartedly, as all Senators here know, for the Ford offer. I did everything in my power to have it accepted. I exceedingly regretted his action when he withdrew his offer. With the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], my good and able friend, I wired Mr. Ford and begged him to reenter the field, asked him to renew his offer, but he did not do so. He is out of our consideration. We are not responsible for the parliamentary status in which we find ourselves. Mr. Ford left us in this situation. When Congress adjourned his bid was pending. So was the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska. Those bills had been reported to the Senate and both of them were on the calendar. When Congress reconvened Mr. Ford's offer had been withdrawn. There was nothing for us to do but to offer a substitute for the Ford offer, and my colleague has done that.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. DILL. I would like to ask the Senator this question: If no legislation is enacted by Congress before the 4th of March, when we will adjourn, what will be the development at Muscle Shoals?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know. I am trying to do something to prevent what I fear would be the situation.

Mr. DILL. Will the Secretary of War have the power to dispose of it?

Mr. HEFLIN. The Secretary of War would in all probability do something with it. I understand that he thinks he has that right. I hardly think he has, but I understand he feels that he has.

Mr. DILL. Does the Senator think that the Secretary of War will assume the power to dispose of it if Congress does not do something?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do. That is the way I feel about it.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. The Secretary of War would not dispose of it except temporarily, and that would be very expensive, for companies would not bid for it. They could not afford to develop it by installing transformers, building transmission lines, and so forth, because Congress might act then and force a different disposition. The delay would be very unfortunate.

Mr. HEFLIN. Of course, it would be unfortunate, and as I was just going to remark, we find ourselves in a situation here for which we are not responsible. Mr. Ford withdrew his offer, and, as I have said, we had to do something other than consider his offer. Those of us who supported his offer naturally felt that we would like to embody in a bill the principal provisions of his offer, and we have done that. I am not entirely satisfied with either one of the pending bills, but I am going to vote for the bill of my colleague [Mr. UNDERWOOD] because it has in it the Ford provision for making fertilizer.

I think I find myself somewhat in the predicament that Congressman Cushman, of the State of Washington, said he was in when he and I were Members of the House. There were two measures before the House, and he favored some of the provisions of both bills and was opposed to some of the provisions of both, but the proponents of each plan failed to get together, so he was not entirely satisfied with either. He said that his predicament reminded him of the fellow who had stolen a horse out in Washington. Out there they usually hanged the horse thief upon the roadside, with a placard on his back saying, "Profit by his example." They caught one fellow who had stolen a horse and took him out into the woods on a moonlight night. While they had a plow line tied to his wrists and were discussing what disposition they would make of him, some of the citizens who had gathered in the mob suggested that they hang him. Others said it would be preferable to shoot him. Still others expressed the desire to hang



him, while others insisted that he should be shot. Finally one tender-hearted gentleman, who had some consideration for the feelings of the prisoner, turned and said, "Gentlemen, let us consult him, and get his 'rathers' about it." They asked him which plan he would prefer—shooting or hanging? And he said, "I am more interested than any of you in the outcome of this thing, but to tell you the truth, I can't enthuse over any one of the plans you have suggested." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, it is not a matter of enthusing over and going into ecstasies over the propositions before us. It is a matter of getting the best legislation possible out of the situation that confronts us.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. HEFLIN. Congress is going to adjourn in less than three months and we will be in vacation probably until next December, and nothing will have been done by Congress with Muscle Shoals; the dam will be completed and the power going to waste, and the Secretary of War will no doubt dispose of it himself during the adjournment of Congress.

I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose the Senator from Nebraska were willing to accept as an amendment to his bill the proposal for the Government corporation to manufacture nitrogen as provided in the Underwood amendment, would not that appeal to the Senator from Alabama now addressing the Senate as being consonant with the views he just expressed? In other words, would it not take the good features of both bills and make a bill that those who believe as the Senator does and as I do and as many others do could get behind?

Mr. HEFLIN. The bill of the Senator from Nebraska proposes Government operation. His bill proposes a limited amount of horsepower to be used for making fertilizer. The whole thing is in confusion and in doubt and uncertainty. I am opposed to putting the Government into any sort of business in opposition to private enterprise. Wherever private enterprise can be controlled I believe in encouraging it and controlling it in the interest of justice and fair play. I do not believe any business ought ever to be permitted to get bigger than the Government. Whenever they get so big we can not control them and they become so powerful and meddlesome politically that they become a menace and a danger, that presents quite another question as to what should be done. But I am in favor, so far as it can be done, of keeping the Government out of competition with the citizens of the Government and I am opposed to the bill of the Senator from Nebraska on that ground. I like some of the features in his bill. I like the flood-control features of his bill, and there are some other improvements on the Tennessee River that I hope to bring about later on unless they are put in some legislation at this session.

But as I was about to say, it is up to the Congress to act at this short session. I repeat, we are not responsible for the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves. Mr. Ford, having withdrawn his offer, left us in this situation. The other bids before the committee are not before the Congress. There is no way to consider those bids now. We have to act on either one of these propositions, either that of my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama, or that of the Senator from Nebraska.

We have amended the bill until it seems to me it is a workable measure. I am in favor of placing some more amendments upon it. I have voted for amendments that have been placed upon it, and I have voted for some that were not adopted. I will support some other amendments, but I do not know whether they will be adopted or not. I am not responsible for that. Let me say in a spirit of good humor to my friend from Tennessee that we are dealing with this subject in a Republican Congress. We have a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican President, and I want to say to him that under these circumstances I shall feel very thankful to get anything of value for the farmers out of this deplorable and unfortunate situation.

I am reminded of the old nigger parson who was preaching around the country and making his way by taking up collections wherever he preached. One night after he finished his sermon he asked one of the brethren sitting in the front seat to pass his hat through the congregation. He passed it all around and no one contributed anything. Not a cent was deposited in the hat. When the empty hat was handed back to the parson he felt in it to be sure if any contribution had been made, and then said with considerable feeling: "Well, there is always something to be thankful for, and I am indeed thankful to get my hat back out of this congregation." [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator think, then, that about all the Government will get out of it, if under this administration it is turned over to the Alabama Power Co., will be its hat back?

Mr. HEFLIN. Let me again remind my friend from Tennessee that we are operating under a Republican administration, and I do not know who is going to get this Muscle Shoals project. The Senator from Tennessee said yesterday that we all know the Alabama Power Co. is going to get it. That is not so, so far as I am concerned. I do not know anything of the sort, and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says that situation is not true—that the Alabama Power Co. said they were not even going to bid for it. I want to say to the Senator from Tennessee that the Alabama Power Co. is doing business in my State, and so long as it conducts itself as it should and conforms to the law, I wish it well in all its operations in my State; and that statement applies to any other industry that may hereafter come into my State. I want to say to the Senator from Tennessee that if the Alabama Power Co. does get it, or if the Tennessee Power Co. gets it, or any other power company gets it, I want to fix the law so that they will have to make fertilizer, just as Ford agreed to make it. I am not responsible for what the President or the Secretary of War will do in the matter of selecting a company to operate the project at Muscle Shoals. I do not know whose bid will be accepted; but it is up to me to help fix the law so that the farmers of the country shall have legislation that will benefit them in the way of compelling the manufacture of fertilizers at Muscle Shoals.

I want to say, moreover, to my friend from Tennessee in the friendliest spirit that his suggestion reminds me of the fellow who is sick and nigh unto death, and they have had one doctor with him who has been physicking him. They have sent for another doctor, and he urges an operation. While one says, "Continue to give him medicine," and the other says, "Only an operation will save him," they call in Doctor McKELLAR, and he says, "I am against giving him any more medicine and I am opposed to an operation." "Well," they say, "what do you suggest, Doctor?" "Nothing." [Laughter.] That would not be very comforting to the patient. The situation here calls for constructive action. Again I want to say, that if I had my choice I would turn this property over to Henry Ford. I would bring him back at this minute and urge the acceptance of his offer. But Henry Ford is out and gone. I am now dealing with questions that are before me, and I am trying to get the very best out of this legislative situation that I can for the great agricultural army of America.

I am going to continue to fight for them. I want to say to my friend from Tennessee, who is the true and tried friend of the farmer, that whoever gets the Muscle Shoals project, I will be here as he will and if they do not track the law, if they do not manufacture fertilizer as we direct them to do, I will be here and he will be here urging that the law be carried out. I will be here as he will undertaking to make them comply with the law or cancel their contract.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HEFLIN. With pleasure.

Mr. DILL. I would like to ask the Senator how much more advantageous Mr. Ford's offer was than the plan proposed by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]?

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, it is different in some particulars, but the Underwood bill contains the same provision on fertilizer that the Ford offer contained, and that is the main reason why I am supporting it.

Mr. DILL. It has not the provision that would give the money back to the Government, has it?

Mr. HEFLIN. I can not inform the Senator as to that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if my colleague will permit me—

Mr. HEFLIN. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that of course the Ford provision about returning the value of the dams to the Government and the dams themselves at the end of 50 years represented that much money out of the farmers of America, because the fertilizer had to pay it. In the proposed provision in the bill the rental of the property to the lessee is to be higher than Mr. Ford intended to pay. The fertilizer proposition was identical with Mr. Ford's proposition until yesterday, when some words were struck out which Senators thought left some doubt about the manufacture of 40,000 tons of nitrogen.

Mr. HEFLIN. That amendment, in my judgment, makes it stronger, because it says they shall make the amount of fertilizer named in the Ford offer.

To come back to the suggestion submitted by my good friend from Tennessee—and I want to say candidly that there is not a more faithful friend of the people in this body than

he—if he ever makes a mistake and goes wrong, as I think he has in this instance, it is an error of the head and not of the heart. We are up against a condition and not a theory. We have got to act or show ourselves incompetent to act, and I am not ready to make a confession of that character, so far as I am concerned. If permitted to do so at this minute I would vote for the Ford offer.

Mr. CARAWAY. Those people who are in favor of the Ford offer could perhaps persuade him, if they insisted, to make even a better offer than this or at least to come in and bid under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. Precisely.

Mr. CARAWAY. There is no provision against that. Even the Senator from Tennessee has not offered an amendment to prevent Ford bidding again.

Mr. HEFLIN. I suppose Ford could do that, and I would like to see him come in and bid under the terms of this bill.

Mr. President, this is a grave situation with which we have to deal. If we vote down the Underwood bill and vote down the Norris bill, Congress will adjourn on the 4th of March with nothing done for the utilization of Muscle Shoals. The dam will soon be completed, and that power will be lost to the Government and lost to the people of the United States unless something is done, unless the Secretary of War should go ahead and dispose of it. Suppose he should do that? I want to say in reply to the suggestion, which I thank my friend [Mr. DILL] from Washington for making, suppose the Secretary of War were to say: "You had an opportunity to act, but you did not act. You left it to me. Power was going to waste and I decided to utilize it to the best interests of the country. I have done so, and in order to do it I had to tell these people that I thought the lease would be made permanent. They have gone there and gone to work, and I feel that we ought not to disturb the contract that I have made with them." Then we would perhaps have the power of the administration backing Mr. Weeks, the Secretary of War, and then the Senate would have thrown away its right to act. That is the serious situation that might arise.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the farmers of the United States have a right to look, and they are looking, for some action to be taken upon this matter at this session of Congress. I think they have a right to expect that action will be taken. I want to say for the benefit of my friend from Tennessee that I have not had a single protest from anybody in our section of the State against the bill presented by my colleague. So far as I know, the people who supported the Ford offer in my section, believing that the Underwood bill carries its provisions regarding fertilizer, are supporting his measure. Why should I not support that proposition when it seems to me that it is more in accord with the Ford proposition than anything else that is before me?

Why was I for the Ford offer? It was because I thought he made it certain that the farmers would get fertilizers and get them at half price. As Mr. Mayo in his testimony said to us, he thought they could produce it at half price, and Mr. Waldo said he thought they could produce it at half price, and other witnesses representing companies having bids for Muscle Shoals stated it could be produced at half price. I want to call to the attention of the Senate what Mr. Mayo said. He said they thought they had a new process for making fertilizer, and thought they could make cheaper fertilizer. Mr. Mayo, Mr. Ford's chief man, said before our committee in response to a question that I asked him, that they thought they had a new process and could make fertilizers at half price. There will be new processes discovered until the manufacture of fertilizers will be brought down in price and the farmers will not have to pay such exorbitant prices for Chilean nitrates.

I saw a one-horse farmer pulling a ton of fertilizer through my town this year, and I asked, "What did you pay for that?" I believe he said the price was \$70 per ton. Was not that the price it was bringing, I will ask my friend from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. SMITH. That was the price during the World War, but the price now is about \$55 per ton.

Mr. HEFLIN. So this Chilean nitrate is now about \$55 a ton, as stated by my friend the Senator from South Carolina, but farmers have paid in the past \$60 and \$70 a ton for it. We are told that there can be made at Muscle Shoals for 5 cents a pound the ingredients that go into fertilizer for which the farmer is now paying 25 cents more per pound, making the price to him 30 cents per pound. We will produce these ingredients, we are assured, for 5 cents a pound and they now cost the farmer 30 cents a pound.

Senators, I do not think it is too much to ask that this Muscle Shoals project be devoted to the fertilizer interests

of our farmers in time of peace. We now have the Keokuk Dam devoted to other interests, with perpetual rights; we have got the aluminum factory of Mr. Mellon, on the Little Tennessee River, with perpetual rights.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator from Alabama has truly stated that we have the Keokuk Dam dedicated to private interests of some kind; and his proposition here is to dedicate the Muscle Shoals plant in the same way. I, of course, know that the power from the Keokuk Dam has done the farmers of Iowa and of Illinois and of Missouri no good, for it went right on past them, and the same thing will happen in this situation as to nearly all of the power at Muscle Shoals if it is turned over to private interests; I do not care whether to Ford or to the Alabama Power Co., or who it may be. They all go the same road.

Mr. HEFLIN. I recall that the Senator from Iowa was bitterly opposed to the Ford offer. With all the persuasive power that we could bring to bear upon him in order to get him to vote with us to turn that project over to Ford to benefit the farmers of the country we could not change him; he stood steadfast against us to the last.

Mr. BROOKHART. I was ready to vote and I am now ready to vote for any kind of a nitrate plant, but I am not ready to vote it to Ford or the Alabama Power Co. or to any other private interest. I can not understand the Senator's position when he picks out Ford as something divine in the way of a private interest and then wants to stamp on everybody else who represents a private interest. No; the Government has put nearly \$150,000,000 into this project, or it will have done so by the time it shall have been completed.

Whether it ought to have done so or not, it has done it; the money is there; it is the money of the people of the United States. It seems to me it would be the part of merely ordinary good sense that we find out what that great plant will do before we turn it over to any private interest on any terms. The Senator from Alabama does not know what it is worth in a lease; the Secretary of War does not know what it is worth in a lease; nobody at this stage knows what it is worth in a lease; and yet the Senator proposes that we jump in the dark and lease the property on some 4 per cent terms or other, which may do the greatest of injustice to the farmers of the United States after all.

The other proposition is that we hold it, that we develop it fully until we find out what it is worth, and then, after that shall have been done, that we dispose of it by lease, if that shall be decided to be the best thing to do.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have just undertaken to point out to the Senator that unless this Congress acts the plant will be disposed of by the Secretary of War in some way.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Secretary of War claims no authority to sell it or to dispose of it in any way, although he does claim authority to sell the power under laws that now exist. I think that is true.

Mr. HEFLIN. If that is true, Mr. President—and it is—suppose the Secretary of War sells the power when Congress is not in session, and we come back here and propose some disposition of it, and we are confronted with a contract such as I referred to a moment ago. Somebody else has the property; they have gone to work in good faith and gone to work because the Congress failed to act. What would we say, then, those of us who opposed action at this session of Congress?

As I said before, if I were permitted to write this bill outright I would have a different situation, but that is not the situation which confronts me. I have sought to get the best I can out of the existing legislative situation. So when we have a distinct provision in the Underwood substitute for the Ford bill, to the effect that any company—I do not know what company it may be since Ford has withdrawn his offer—shall make fertilizer, as Ford agreed to make it, what more can I do? Such a company would have to comply with the law; and if it did not comply with the law it could not operate and we would endeavor to take the property from them. In that way we shall protect the interests of the farmer.

Mr. BROOKHART. Even at that, there is no assurance that the price of fertilizer will be any less than it now is. The private lessee can join with the present Fertilizer Trust and go ahead selling fertilizer at the same old price and as a part of the same combination. This proposed law will not control that in any way. It is proposed to provide an 8 per cent profit limit on the turnover, not on the investment in the enterprise or anything of that kind.



Here will come a lessee, perhaps with a small amount of capital invested, who will get 8 per cent profit on his turnover, which may be 100 or 1,000 per cent profit on his actual investment.

I see no cheap fertilizer in this proposition in any way.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator was not in the Chamber when I was discussing that situation. I cited the testimony before our committee of all the competent witnesses that fertilizer could be made at Muscle Shoals for half the present price.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. If I understood the Senator correctly, I think he said that if he could write a bill it would not be exactly like the bill now before us. May I ask what sort of a bill would the Senator propose if he could have his way?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I have not the time to go into the details as to what I would write into a bill. I would provide several things in that situation. I would make arrangements for the disposition of the power that would not be used for the production of fertilizer; but I am not going to take up the time of the Senate to go into that now. There is no use for me to do so, because it will not help the situation here. I am going to act as best I can with the light that is before me under the peculiar parliamentary situation that binds me. I repeat that I had nothing to do with bringing that situation about. I want the Senate to act wisely and in the interest of the Government and the farmers of the country.

I wish to say to my friend from Iowa, who comes from a great farming State, that I am willing to take a chance as to whether or not the proposal now before us will benefit the farmers. I have seen one measure after another go through Congress to benefit other interests in this country, and I am getting weary of having objection made when we are seeking to accomplish something that will benefit the farmers of the country. Let us try it, and if it fails we can say, some of us, that we made an honest effort in their behalf.

What can we do if the lessees fail to comply with the law? In that event we can upset the contract and oust the lessees. The bill is so written now that I am convinced the lessees will have to make fertilizer and we will have a way of knowing whether they make it cheaply or not after we let them make 8 per cent profit and no more.

The farmers of my section were in favor of the Ford offer. Those who favored the Ford offer from that section are in favor of this bill, mainly, because it contains the provision that the Ford offer contained regarding the production of fertilizer. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I would rather take my stand in support of a measure that has written in it such a provision as that to which I have referred than to support various impossible theories suggested by Senators that go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but that can not get into the bill which is going to be passed by this body.

I know that one of these measures is going to be passed, and, in my judgment, it will be the Underwood bill. Let us improve it and perfect it as nearly as we can. If it is not in the proper form, let us put it in the proper form, and then pass it on to the House and get final action on this subject. Let the Congress express its judgment on it and not leave it up to the Secretary of War and the President, because they must finally act in the matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to follow up the idea suggested by the Senator from Iowa. I do not say it as just a mere formal expression but I say it sincerely, that the Senator from Alabama, I believe, is as zealous and earnest in his desire to help the farmers of this country as is any man in this body.

Now, the situation that confronts us is an alternative between the two plans incorporated in the bill to which the Senator has referred; namely, that there shall be an effort made to secure a lessee, and, failing that, then there is provision made and the terms are set forth, for a Government corporation which is to proceed with the development and operation of this plant. Both the Government and the private lessee are to be under identically the same prohibitions and restrictions. Does not the Senator believe that it would infinitely strengthen this proposition if at this stage of the development at Muscle Shoals we would strike from this bill all provisions looking toward a lease and provide merely for the Government corporation as it is now contemplated by the bill, until such time

at least as that corporation, which will be absolutely under our control, with the terms of its operation subject to modification and change by Congress at any time we see fit, may develop and perfect the production of the thing to which the project was consecrated in the first bill that was introduced here and which I myself had the honor of introducing; namely, fertilizer for the farmers during times of peace and munitions during time of war?

We have now a plant there, and, under the contract, although the Government does not own the patents, nevertheless the Government may use them. That plant is not a theory, but it is a fact. It will produce 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen beginning to-morrow, if the testimony of those who have had it in charge amount to anything. Along with it is nitrate plant No. 1, which the Government is continuously using for experimental purposes to see if they can not cheapen the process.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, in connection with that is it not true that the Government can not assign the right to use the patents to a lessee?

Mr. SMITH. I think that is true; and that question was discussed here the other day on the floor; but, taking the situation as it stands, the Government has the right to use the patents and it has a plant there which will produce 40,000 tons of nitrogen to be available for the farmers of the State of the Senator from Alabama and of my State and of all the other farmers of the country. The process, however, has not yet reached that stage of development which the airplane, the submarine, the steam engine, and the automobile have reached. The principle is there; we know that nitrogen can be produced from the air. When Wright first made his little tentative flight science knew that it was possible for man to navigate the air, but there was a vast difference between the plane used in that initial attempt and the present perfected airplane.

Does not the Senator from Alabama believe that Congress, appointing its own agent and that agent acting under its direction, can go there and determine what can or can not be done, and then when that fact has been demonstrated would we not be in a better position to know what we were turning over, if we desired to turn it over, than to give it up now in the very inception of what I believe to be the revolutionizing of all fertilizer production in this country?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I think it is for the best interest of the farmers of the country to enact a law now which has the Ford provision in it for making fertilizer at Muscle Shoals, and the quicker we can get that production started the better it will be for hundreds of thousands of the farmers of the country. We are already providing in this bill that time shall be given before they shall be required to reach the maximum, but, as I recall, the production of 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen will be required in the fourth year. I fear that any kind of delay will postpone the day when I believe we can deliver the farmers of America from the Fertilizer Trust. I want to hasten, as I know my friend from South Carolina does, the day of their deliverance. We have got to act on one of these bills before us; and if we fail to take decisive action, I think action will be taken by the War Department during the adjournment of Congress. So far as I am concerned, I want to see some action taken by Congress before we adjourn.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] said that we have spent about \$150,000,000 at Muscle Shoals. Let me say to him that we are paying to Chile for nitrates just about \$150,000,000 every 12 years. Four times 12 is 48. We are giving to Chile four times one hundred and fifty millions in the 50 years that we would lease this plant to somebody that would make fertilizer to help bring down the price of nitrates to the farmers of the country, and I do not think that is asking so very much. With the Keokuk Dam in Iowa, the Senator's own State, with perpetual rights to a company up there, and with the dams in other places with perpetual rights, I do not think we are going too far to permit this great project to be used in the interest of the Government in time of war and in the interest of the farmers in time of peace.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if I were in my home city of New York I should not have to say what I want to say now, and that is, that I hold no brief for the New York World. While I feel a degree of thankfulness for the support it gave me during my campaign to come to this honorable body, we frequently differ on questions of policy. I should like to say to the Senator from Mississippi, however—I am sorry he is not here—that there are no "editorial novices" on that paper.

It is true that there are some technical errors in the editorial printed in the World this morning, but the spirit of this

editorial—what is known in the newspaper world as the "lead" of the editorial—is entirely correct.

I want to review, just a little, what the editorial says:

If the Underwood Muscle Shoals bill comes to a vote in its present form, the World hopes that the Senate will vote it down.

If the bill passes and goes to the House, the World hopes that the House will amend it. This bill is wrong.

It is wrong because its authors insist upon treating the Shoals as a nitrate plant rather than a power source and thereafter fail to protect the public interest in that power.

No one can read the Underwood bill without recognizing the correctness of the statement of the New York World. On page 4 of the bill, where the price is fixed upon fertilizer, in line 12, it is distinctly stated that the price "shall be limited to a maximum net profit which may be made not to exceed 8 per cent of the fair annual cost of the production thereof"; but when it comes to the sale of surplus electric power, as provided for on the next page of the bill, there is no provision for fixing the profit on the power sale.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I challenge his statement.

Mr. COPELAND. I shall be very happy if the Senator from Alabama will point out at this time, if he so prefers, where such essential protection is given. To this end I have introduced an amendment, which I hope to have adopted—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know whether the sale of power is regulated in New York State or not. I know they do regulate the price that you shall pay to ride on a street car or a railroad, and I suppose they regulate the sale of power. In Alabama and Mississippi and Georgia and Tennessee, the adjacent States where this power is likely to be sold, there is regulation of power and prices of power by State commissions in the interests of their people, and this bill very distinctly provides, in section 10, that—

The surplus power not required under the terms of this act for the manufacture of nitrogen or fertilizer, when sold or used shall be subject to the laws, rules, and regulations relating to the sale and use of electric power in the several States in which said power is used.

Of course, I belong to the Jeffersonian school. If the Senator prefers to join the Hamiltonian school and have the regulation of power in Washington instead of in the several States that is another matter. This bill does not regulate it from Washington, but it could not be more clearly expressed than it is in the bill that the States in which the power is used under their State laws shall regulate its sale, and they do regulate its sale; and I must say that in the State of Alabama we have very reasonable power, the sale of which and the price of which is regulated by the Public Service Commission of Alabama.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the power of the Public Service Commission of Alabama apply to power originating outside of the State and simply distributed within the State, or only to power originating in the State?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It applies to any power used in the State; but, of course, so far as this particular bill is concerned the power would originate in the State.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; I know it would. I am just asking for illumination. Now, how about Tennessee?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. My understanding of the law is that it applies to all power used and sold; but, so far as my knowledge goes, there is no power used or sold in Alabama that is not created in the State.

Mr. BRUCE. Precisely. There is usually, of course, a provision in connection with these public-service commissions giving the commission power to regulate rates for power originating outside of the State and distributed in the State as well as power originating in and distributed in the State.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BRUCE. I suppose that is true of Tennessee, and probably of Mississippi.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But if there is any State where there is additional regulation needed it is within the power of the State to do it within the terms of this bill. So I say that I challenge the statement that the Senator from New York commends in the World editorial that the sale of this power is not protected. It is protected if you believe that people in the States have a right to protect themselves. Of course, if the New York World, which is generally conceded to be a Democratic paper, has gone to the other school and thinks that we

should regulate these matters from Washington and not from New York or Alabama then I yield and say that the bill does not regulate them from Washington, but that there is ample provision to protect the people of the several States in which this power shall be used—there is not any question about it—if they want to use it in that way.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. At this point I should like to make this statement to the Senator from New York, and also in the hearing of the Senator from Alabama:

I propose to offer—I do not know, of course, what fate the amendment will meet with—I propose to offer an amendment to this bill, at appropriate places in the bill, providing for the distribution of the surplus power, and to commend that statement to the Senator in connection with what the Senator from Alabama has said—

Mr. COPELAND. Will the Senator repeat what his amendment will be?

Mr. GEORGE. I propose to offer an amendment at the appropriate places in this bill—one at least, possibly two places—dealing with the surplus electric power in language that shall require the distribution of the surplus electric power. I have no disposition, of course, to interfere at all with the use of the power for the primary purposes set out in this bill; and that, in connection with the statement made by the Senator from Alabama, would bring about this situation:

There would be a regulation as to the surplus power. The manner of its disposition would be indicated in the bill—at least the general policy would be fixed—as well as the bodies in the several States that would have jurisdiction over fixing the prices of this power. I myself regard it as vital that there shall be a distribution of the surplus power, and that it shall be distributed by the lessee or sold for distribution; and I myself would have no objection to a further provision that in its sale preference should be given to States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, to the end that the people themselves might have the full benefit of this Muscle Shoals development. But at least I shall offer the amendment providing for the distribution of the surplus electric energy or power, and that this distribution shall be made by the lessee, or he must sell for the purpose of distribution; and then I think the Senator from Alabama has very correctly said that that power thus disposed of does become subject to the rules of the utilities commissions in the several States where sold or used, and it therefore could not be correctly said that no protection is given to the public.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senators for their comments and questions. I think perhaps the Senator from Alabama and I have both wandered from the Jeffersonian school when we provide for any sort of governmental ownership; but the bill of the Senator from Alabama in its second section strikes me as a very strong Hamiltonian document. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call the attention of the Senator from New York to the fact that Mr. Jefferson himself favored and proposed a national militia for the defense of the country and repeatedly in his public documents sustained a national militia for the defense of the country, and I take it that guns and powder go with a national militia. So I thoroughly agree with the Senator. I never have been a public-ownership man. My record is against it, except when it becomes a problem where the national defense is involved; and I have even gone so far in this bill—which is objected to by some of my colleagues for that reason—as to try to get a lessee first and have this matter of national defense in the hands of a private citizen of the United States rather than the Government; and under this bill I only go to Government operation in order that there may be powder to keep a foreign fleet from blowing the city of New York off the map. In that event, as the last resort, I am willing to try to save the Senator's own constituency from that disastrous result by allowing the Government to make the nitrogen.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I desire, in the name of my constituents, to thank the Senator from Alabama for the consideration he has for the great group living in the city of New York. But I suppose after all it does not matter much what Hamilton or Jefferson might have thought of a plan of this sort. The question is, What can the Congress do under these immediate circumstances?

If we possibly could avoid Government operation of a great utility I should certainly vote in harmony with the Senator from Alabama on that particular matter, because on general



principles I oppose Government ownership and operation. If we were considering this matter de novo I doubt exceedingly if at this time the Senate would vote large sums of money like \$150,000,000 to develop a plant if a private operator could be found to do that very thing. However, we have the property, and it has been very clearly pointed out, I think by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that there would be a tremendous amount of surplus power, even after the 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen had been developed. There is no question about that, is there? There is no question that there will be this surplus power which must be disposed of.

It would seem a very wise thing to me, regardless of whether it is Jeffersonian doctrine or Hamiltonian, to make clear that in the sale of that surplus power there would not be the possibility of excessive profits. I have offered two amendments, which will be brought up in due time, to limit the profit from the sale of this surplus power to 8 per cent, just the same as the Senator from Alabama, in preparing his substitute, limited the profit on the fertilizer to that amount. But perhaps this is a matter which can be disposed of when the amendments come before us.

It is my judgment there is no difference of opinion in this chamber as to the desirability and the necessity of making use of the power at Muscle Shoals for the development of nitrates in time of war, and of fertilizer in time of peace. There is no doubt that we all want to accomplish that end; but the question is, what is the wise thing to do at this moment?

If I have learned anything from this debate, I have learned that all those who would bid for this property, all those who have any personal interest in its acquisition, have consulted with Doctor Cottrell and the other experts of the Agriculture Department about the progress of the science of chemistry as it relates to the making of fertilizer. Our Government has applied scientific knowledge to the determination of the best method of making fertilizer, and if I am rightly advised, the methods which are now used are largely American; at least, the modifications which have been made to make the fertilizer cheaper and better have been the result of American genius.

Is it not a wise thing to continue that work of experimentation? It is certainly important to the farmers of the country, because the fertilizer must be developed at some lower price. But is it not important to the farmers of the country that this experimentation should go along, in order that we may find better ways and cheaper ways of making fertilizers?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the Senator does not think there is anything in this substitute that interferes with Doctor Cottrell's bureau and his experimentation, does he?

Mr. COPELAND. I think this, Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I know of nothing in the substitute that affects his bureau at all.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to say this, that as compared with the Norris bill I would say the Underwood substitute is very weak on that subject. The Norris bill specifically provides that the Department of Agriculture shall take over plants Nos. 1 and 2 and continue their work of the development of the science of fertilizer production, and at the same time it makes certain that the needs of the Government as regards national defense are served. Distinct provision is made that the amount made at plant No. 2 must not be less than 40,000 tons per year. Am I right in that?

Mr. NORRIS. No; the committee bill does not provide for the making of any specific amount. It does provide, just as the Senator has said, that nitrate plant No. 1 shall be used on a larger scale than they are able in their laboratories to carry out their laboratory tests, and if they will work out, to work them out until the articles can be produced in commercial quantities.

Mr. COPELAND. Is there not a provision, too, that plant No. 2 must not be dismantled or changed until some better method is developed?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. COPELAND. In other words, then, under the Norris bill there would be some certainty of the production of 40,000 tons.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all. There is nothing in the bill of my friend from Nebraska that requires the operation of either of these plants. It is true that he does say that this experimental bureau in Washington can run plant No. 1. He turns it over to it. But, according to the terms of his bill, he leaves plant No. 2 without an appropriation, lying obsolescent, but provides that it must not be disturbed. My substitute provides for its operation and the production of nitrogen. Up to this time, as the bill stands now, there is no direction or compulsion for the manufacture of fertilizer for commercial use,

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from New York will permit—  
Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. It turns over both the nitrate plants to the department. They can both be operated. But it is not assumed that they will operate nitrate plant No. 2 and make nitrates at a loss. It is not assumed that they are going to make a lot of nitrates, except it be in time of war, unless they can make them at a price which will cheapen the commercial price of fertilizer. In other words, the bill goes on the theory that it would mean only a loss of power and a loss of money to operate nitrate plant No. 2 now to its capacity, when there would be no opportunity to sell the product unless we sold it at a loss. The Underwood substitute provides that it must be operated, and that it must produce, even if at a loss. We think that is not economically sound, and that it will not redound to the benefit of anybody.

As the Senator who is now addressing the Senate knows better than the rest of us, a laboratory test may show some operation to be perfect, as far as the laboratory test is concerned, but when it is tried on a commercial scale it may be a failure, and it is often more difficult, after the laboratory test is made, to put it on a commercial basis than it was to make the discovery in the laboratory. That is well known to scientific men.

Our idea was to turn over nitrate plant No. 2 as an experimental plant. It is sufficiently large for that. It will be the largest of that kind in the world used for that purpose. Then, when the laboratory test had been worked out, the idea was to give it a practical application in nitrate plant No. 1, and if the product were cheapened, let the entire world use it; and they could use it also in nitrate plant No. 2. But until the process shall have been cheapened, as a matter of national defense, the bill provides that nitrate plant No. 2 must not be disturbed, the idea being that if, in the meantime, we got into a war, we would need nitrate plant No. 2 to produce explosives, regardless of the cost. It can produce now 40,000 tons a year, but at a price that would not justify them in making a commercial fertilizer out of it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his comments. I do think that there is one very weak point in the Norris bill, which I think the author himself admits. I do not like the limitation to 100,000 horsepower, of which not more than 25,000 should be primary power. It seems to me that in the development of this experimental work and of the manufacture of fertilizer at these plants, the Secretary of Agriculture should be free to call upon the War Department for just as much power as is necessary. We are all agreed here that in the last analysis the purpose of this enterprise is the development of fixed nitrogen, and it might well happen that in this experimentation a very much larger quantity of power would be required than would be given by 25,000 primary horsepower out of a total of 100,000.

Mr. SMITH. With the permission of the Senator from New York, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. He said a moment ago that in the form in which the fixed nitrogen was obtained at plant No. 1 it was not now produced at such a price as to be available for use in the ordinary commercial fertilizer. Has the Senator official figures to sustain that?

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, yes, Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will permit. I want to say that, as far as I know, without any exception, all of those familiar with the operation say that is true. Major Burns says that you could not do it if you were not charged a cent for your power. If you got it operated for absolutely nothing you still could not make fertilizer cheap enough at the nitrate plant now to lower the price of commercial fertilizer on the market.

Mr. SMITH. I did not go into the particulars with the scientists here; but my impression, from both of our scientific men at the head of this department, was to the effect that it was commercially available. I think the cyanamide plant at Niagara is making a profit.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but it is not making fertilizer as a chief product. That is simply a by-product.

Mr. SMITH. But it is making an ingredient that the fertilizer manufacturers readily avail themselves of as one of the sources of nitrogen. It comes in competition with Chilean nitrate, with ammonium sulphate, with blood and tankage and the other forms, from whatever derivative the ammonium, which is another form of nitrogen, is obtained. Doctor Whitney told me that they put the cyanamide, which contains the nitrogen, in a matrix of lime and treat it with steam, and they get, of course, ammonium gas, which is readily converted into the sulphate of ammonia by another process which

the fertilizer people have. It may not be directly available for the farmer in the present form. It would be if he wanted to put it on as a top dressing, where the soil was not all alkali, because the lime would alkali the soil. But it is available, and, my information is, available in competition with other sources of nitrogen. However, I am not in a position to state that officially, but I will be before this debate is over.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit another interruption—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I am well satisfied, and I think even the Senator from Alabama is also well satisfied, that nitrate plant No. 2, with the knowledge we have now of the cyanamide process, is not a commercial proposition in the manufacture of fertilizer, and I have no doubt whatever about that. The scientific men all, with unanimity, I think, agree to that. With the Cyanamid Co. of Canada, which is making and selling cyanamide, the fertilizer proposition is a secondary consideration. I understand they make no fertilizer. They make other products, various kinds of things that are used in various kinds of industries—in medicines, and so forth—and they have a by-product, the cyanamide, that is sold and used in small quantities by manufacturers of fertilizer. It is just an incident to their business, as I understand it.

But I rose to make a statement to the Senator from New York as to his criticism of the committee bill in its limitation of power. I want to tell the Senator how that came in. Of course, the committee had the bill before it was reported by me. This is one of the committee modifications. That limit was put in after the committee had put in an amendment which gave to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to lease nitrate plants No. 1 and No. 2 and all the scientific operations there if he could improve agriculture, in his judgment, in that way.

It was not in my bill originally, but when the committee put that provision in it became evident at once that it might happen that somebody, some power interest, or some subsidiary of a power company might obtain that lease, not so much for the purpose of cheapening the manufacture of fertilizer as to interfere with the distribution and sale of power. They would be willing to lose something in one way if they could keep that power out of competition with the power companies which are now operating there. So it was said that if that kind of a corporation gets in here they will demand that the Government corporation have control of all of the power when they do not need it.

We assumed that if the Secretary of Agriculture was doing it, being a Government officer, of course he could not ask for any more than he needed. We were informed by our experts that in all their experimentations and in the operation of plant No. 1 for the purpose of trying out their laboratory tests they never would need as much as 25,000 horsepower. In fact, we all became convinced from the statements of chemists who have testified that the tendency of improvement now and for years in the cheapening of fertilizer has been to use less and less power. The cyanamide process down there to operate that plant for explosives will take between 80,000 and 100,000 horsepower. The same work could probably be done by modification of the Haber process with 25,000 horsepower. But we thought that in the limitation we were very liberal.

If the Senate wants to take out of the committee bill the leasing proposition, giving the Secretary of Agriculture the power to lease, then I think we ought to take that matter all out of the bill. If they want to leave the leasing power in there, then there is danger if we take it out, as I think the Senator can see, that some sinister motive may be brought about by some interested parties if they should succeed in getting such a lease that might cripple the power end of it.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the explanation is entirely satisfactory. It explains, of course, why the limitation was placed there.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina in just a moment. Personally, I am opposed to the leasing because that ties up the project, and so I would hitch to the provision to strike out the limitation on the amount of power the removal of the clause permitting the leasing, and then we would be entirely agreed, I am sure.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him again, I hope the Senator will proceed by the other route and let the Senate settle whether we are going to lease or not. If we do, it will follow that the other will be stricken out, I think, as a matter of form. Personally I agree with the Sen-

ator on the leasing proposition. The committee thought otherwise, and it was put in. I might say that at a subsequent meeting during this session of Congress for an hour or an hour and a half the question was discussed. We took no action. The committee members were not all there, but there was a good attendance. So far as any opinion was expressed at that meeting, every member expressed the opinion that he thought we ought to take out the leasing provision and also the limitation of power. So I am inclined to think a majority of the committee, after listening to the debate, are rather convinced upon that subject.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. COPELAND. I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey in just a moment. I promised the Senator from South Carolina to yield to him in order that he might answer a question, and I will then gladly yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I did not care to assume, with the knowledge I had of this matter, to contend with the Senator about plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, now ready for full capacity of the plant, so I went into the telephone booth and called up the Bureau of Soils. I am loath always to repeat both my question and the answer over the telephone. I would rather prefer to have submitted my question in writing and had the answer in writing, but I am sure the officer there understood what my question meant.

I said, "A question has arisen on the floor of the Senate as to whether the nitrogen produced in cyanamide form at Muscle Shoals as a source of nitrogen for commercial purposes to be mixed in our ordinary commercial plant is on a competitive basis with other sources of nitrogen." He said, "Yes; more than competitive. It is cheaper than other sources of nitrogen." I think he will repeat that over his signature.

Mr. NORRIS. But that does not demonstrate still that we could make it cheaper than anybody could make fertilizer.

Mr. SMITH. They use it to make fertilizer, of course.

Mr. NORRIS. There are many other sources of nitrogen that are conceded to be much more expensive.

Mr. SMITH. Let me say this, if the Senator from New York will allow me, and then I am through. There are comparatively few sources of nitrogen available for fertilizer purposes or any other purpose. I asked if the 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen that could be produced right now at plant No. 2 was in a form that could compete with other sources of nitrogen. He said, "Yes; more than compete. It is cheaper than any other source." That is from the department itself.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. COPELAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

#### RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. EDGE. May I ask the Senator from New York if he will permit me to present a unanimous-consent agreement in relation to a vote upon the veto on the postal salary bill? In order to do so, it will be necessary to call for a quorum in the usual way, but I am going to make an effort to secure unanimous consent. I have a proposition to make, and if the Senator will indulge me so that the roll may be called, I will take advantage of that opportunity.

Mr. COPELAND. The matter is so important that I certainly should not want to interfere with it at all. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey for that purpose.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest that the unanimous consent be presented first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Clerk calls the roll first, it may be it will require another roll call in order to decide on the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest that the proposal be read and then it will not be necessary to call the roll a second time.

Mr. EDGE. Following the suggestion of the President pro tempore I will present the unanimous-consent request, which I ask may be read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield for that purpose?

Mr. COPELAND. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous-consent request presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be read.



The reading clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the routine morning business on the calendar day of February 2, 1925, the Senate will proceed to the reconsideration and final disposition of the bill (S. 1898) reclassifying salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, and for other purposes, heretofore returned by the President of the United States without his approval; that no Senator shall speak longer than one hour on the bill, and that, if the bill is not finally disposed of on that calendar day, thereafter no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Ferris	McKinley	Sheppard
Bayard	Fess	McNary	Shipstead
Borah	Frazier	Mayfield	Simmons
Brookhart	George	Means	Smith
Broussard	Glass	Metcalf	Smoot
Bruce	Hale	Moses	Stanfield
Bursum	Harrell	Neely	Sterling
Butler	Harris	Norbeck	Swanson
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Caraway	Heflin	Oddie	Underwood
Copeland	Howell	Overman	Wadsworth
Couzens	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Phipps	Watson
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Ralston	Weller
Dial	Kendrick	Randsell	Willis
Dill	Keyes	Reed, Mo.	
Edge	Ladd	Reed, Pa.	
Fernald	McKellar	Robinson	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will again read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The reading clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the routine morning business on the calendar day of February 2, 1925, the Senate will proceed to the reconsideration and final disposition of the bill (S. 1898) reclassifying salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, and for other purposes, heretofore returned by the President of the United States without his approval; that no Senator shall speak longer than one hour on the bill, and that, if the bill is not finally disposed of on that day, thereafter no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the bill.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, the object of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is, I am sure, obvious. Since the present session of Congress convened we have received a report on the ascertainment of the costs of handling the various classes of mail matter. That cost ascertainment has disclosed rather astonishing facts. The Post Office Department reports a loss of \$132,000,000 in the handling of various classes of mail matter as against a profit in the handling of first-class mail matter of \$80,000,000, with other items, making a net loss of \$39,000,000 in handling the various classes of mail matter. That presents to Congress, in my judgment, a problem which should be given careful consideration.

I am firmly of the opinion, and have expressed it on many occasions, that the salary bill which passed almost unanimously at the last session of Congress is an entirely fair and justified measure and should become a law; but in view of the fact of this additional information demonstrating, in my judgment, that the revenues should be increased, it seems to me it is our duty to make every effort to try to meet that situation.

I have suggested in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement a vote on February 2, for the purpose of giving Congress somewhat over a month, in order to try to give consideration at least to the subject of increasing the revenue of the Post Office Department.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment if the Senator will permit me to conclude my observations.

It will not in any way prejudice the salary bill should Congress vote February 2. The measure is retroactive in its terms; the salaries are payable, going back to July 1, if the bill becomes a law, and if this agreement is entered into it simply gives Congress the additional opportunity of considering this very important problem of increasing revenues in the Postal Service. It is further perfectly obvious if this bill remains the unfinished business, which it will do under the unanimous-consent agreement if entered into, and be taken up and finally disposed of on the date mentioned, it will in the meantime have some helpful effect on the enactment of revenue-

increasing legislation. In my judgment salary-increasing legislation and revenue-increasing legislation as well are accomplishments much to be desired.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. EDGE. I yield first to the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], who first addressed the Chair.

Mr. DILL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. How can the Senator from New Jersey expect to get this bill through if he delays its consideration until the 2d of February and it shall on that date be merely the unfinished business? Any appropriation bill can then displace it, and when it shall have been displaced the Senator will have accomplished nothing except a delay until the 2d of February, and then a further delay from day to day.

Mr. EDGE. But this is a highly privileged matter, as the Senator from Virginia well knows, and nothing could displace it under the unanimous-consent agreement. It must be disposed of, so far as the Senate is concerned, under any ordinary estimate, in two days.

Mr. SWANSON. No; the proposed unanimous-consent agreement does not say the bill must be disposed of in two days. It seems to me that should the Senate consent to the unanimous-consent agreement it will be invited into a situation where we shall not secure a vote on the bill.

Mr. EDGE. I am not in the slightest degree worried about that. If the Senator from Virginia will review the history of the Senate under such agreements, he will find that a limitation of debate to 10 minutes for each Senator and permitting a Senator to speak but once on the subject has always resulted in a final disposition of a measure within a reasonable time.

Mr. SWANSON. But, as the Senator will note, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, to which he has apparently consented, does not prevent a Senator from speaking on other matters. If this bill shall be laid aside, and an appropriation bill shall be taken up, it will lose its position as the unfinished business.

Senators can talk for hours and hours on an appropriation bill. If the Senator should insert a provision that at the end of three days the bill shall be disposed of, it would be effective, but it seems to me that all we should get under this proposed unanimous-consent agreement would be a delay in action on the bill until the 2d of February.

The proposed unanimous-consent agreement contains a limitation of debate on the bill which it is designed to cover, but not upon other matters.

Mr. EDGE. I have not the slightest objection to putting in a limitation of three days, but I can not agree at all with the construction of the Senator from Virginia as to the result of the unanimous-consent agreement as it now reads. If the measure can not command the vote of a majority of the Senate in order to keep it from being displaced, it is perfectly obvious it can not command a two-thirds vote of the Senate to pass it over a veto. Once under consideration as the business of the Senate, as is provided in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, the limitation of speeches is clearly set forth, and I can not conceive why there should be any question as to there being a final vote upon the measure in two days at the outside. I do not want the bill to be put in such a position that any possible question, however remote, could be raised. I am perfectly ready to add a limitation of three days.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from New Jersey has charge of the bill and it is a measure for the passage of which he seems to have taken the responsibility; but under this proposed unanimous-consent agreement as it will finally operate on the 2d of February, with all the legislation then pending, and no agreement to keep the bill before the Senate until disposed of, I am simply going to prophesy—and I hope he has assurances on the other side of the Chamber that the prophecy will not be realized—that he will not secure the enactment of this bill into legislation before Congress adjourns on the 4th of March next.

Mr. EDGE. Then, how does the Senator construe the words "final disposition"?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not think the proposal of the Senator from New Jersey is open to the criticism that it will not provide with practical certainty for a vote on the bill at this session. The provision of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is that during the first day, which is the 2d of February, on which the bill is considered, debate is limited; that is, that no Senator

shall speak longer than one hour; and at the end of that day another limitation goes into effect, to wit, that no Senator shall speak longer than 10 minutes. It is distinctly provided in the proposed agreement that the bill shall be finally disposed of.

If it is not disposed of by the end of the 2d day of February, on the 3d day of February or on any day thereafter that it may be considered no Senator shall speak longer than 10 minutes nor more than once. The total length of time to be consumed in debate, if every Senator availed himself of the privilege of debate provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement, would be 10 minutes each for 96 Senators, if every seat in the Senate were filled. So I believe the unanimous-consent agreement, if entered into, will make it certain that the bill will be voted on and finally disposed of. If it has virtue, that is the virtue of the proposal.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator from Missouri, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me.

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator has a copy of the agreement before him. I will ask does it say calendar day or legislative day? It should say calendar day, because there might be no legislative day of February 2.

Mr. ROBINSON. It says on the calendar day—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. ROBINSON. Which makes certain that no legislative fiction can prevent the bill from being proceeded with on the second day of February.

Under this agreement, which is just as specific, I think, as an agreement could be made, on the second day of February the bill will be taken up; any Senator who can get the floor may speak an hour on it, but no longer; and at the end of that day, which would mean midnight on the second day of February, if debate should be continued and the bill is not disposed of by that time, the limitation of 10 minutes goes into effect, and no Senator may speak more than once.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator for his view of such a situation as this which might arise: Suppose a motion is made to proceed to the consideration of some other measure, which, if agreed to, would displace this bill as the unfinished business. Is there any limitation of debate on such a motion?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have already suggested that if a majority of the Senate is prepared to consider other business at any time there will be no use of proceeding further with the measure. So far as I know a unanimous-consent agreement couched in similar language has never operated to prevent debate on any subject in the world that Senators see fit to debate.

Mr. SWANSON. So the Senator is in this attitude if this agreement shall be entered into, that when the debate is commenced under the 10-minute rule a motion may be made to proceed to the consideration of any other measure, for filibustering purposes or otherwise, and there will be no limitation on the debate on the second motion which, if agreed to, would displace this measure as the order of business.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator from Virginia point out any previous unanimous-consent agreement that has prevented a Senator from speaking on any subject upon which he desired to speak?

Mr. SWANSON. The only way to make it effective is to provide that at 3 o'clock on a certain day the Senate shall proceed to vote and that the roll shall be called. Then there can be no filibustering. Senators can talk up to that time, and then the Chair will order the roll to be called. There is no such provision included in this proposed agreement.

Mr. EDGE. As I have indicated several times, I thought this proposed unanimous-consent agreement was double-barreled. It says "until final disposition" in one place and "until finally disposed of" in another.

Now, if there can be any successful question raised, I do not want that question to exist. I am giving two days' opportunity for debate, or more, using the word "thereafter." I am entirely satisfied to have the unanimous-consent agreement perfected by stating that a vote shall be taken not later than February 4 at 12 o'clock.

Mr. ROBINSON. I make no objection to that modification. The difficulty, if it is regarded as a difficulty, suggested by the Senator from Virginia, can be obviated by providing that the bill shall be kept before the Senate until finally disposed of.

Mr. EDGE. The simpler the language the better.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I want to know whether this unanimous-consent agreement as drawn shuts out a motion to refer this bill back to the committee, such as the Senator from South Dakota is said to have intended to make.

Mr. EDGE. My impression is that there are no unanimous-consent agreements that would shut out a motion to do almost anything.

Mr. DILL. Why does the Senator postpone this matter until the 2d of February, which is within a month of the date of adjournment? Why could it not be advanced to the 2d of January? I raised the question here on Wednesday, before the Muscle Shoals matter came before the Senate, about getting a vote on this question, and I was assured that we would have a chance to vote. A few days ago the Senator tried to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote to-day, I think, or to-morrow, and that was denied, and he announced that he would move to take up the question at the earliest opportunity. Now he comes here with a proposition for unanimous consent to postpone it until 30 days before the end of the session.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I make that proposition in the interest of the final success of the bill. I might say that in considering this unanimous-consent agreement I have gone to the trouble—very properly so, I think—of consulting many men who are interested in this legislation.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. EDGE. The Senator may.

Mr. ROBINSON. It would be interesting to know whether the legislative representatives of the postal employees who are here are in sympathy with the proposal which the Senator submits.

Mr. EDGE. So far as I have been able to ascertain—and I think I know most of them—they are unanimously in sympathy with the proposition. I do not want any thought or inference to exist that if this unanimous-consent agreement is denied, so far as I am concerned, there will be any unavoidable delay in calling for a vote. Just as I said a few days ago, I shall call for a vote as soon as the rules of the Senate will permit; but in the interest of the legislation, in the interest of trying to solve two big problems, in the interest of trying to meet a situation which I recognize should be met, I believe that this unanimous-consent agreement serves a double purpose, and serves it well.

Mr. DILL. What assurance can the Senator give us that legislation to raise this revenue will be passed to remove the objection?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. The bill is now being prepared and will be introduced no later than day after to-morrow, and we hope it will be introduced to-morrow.

Mr. SWANSON. Introduced where?

Mr. CURTIS. Here in the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. A bill raising revenue can not originate in the Senate. It must originate in the House.

Mr. CURTIS. If the bill is so worded that it can not originate here, arrangements will be made for its introduction in the House of Representatives.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator knows full well that there is a constitutional inhibition against a bill to provide revenue originating in the Senate. Then you are arranging this matter under the idea that something will occur in the House and the bill will come over here?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator from Kansas is well aware of the fact that revenue bills must originate in the House; but the Senator has said that if the bill is so worded that it can not originate in the Senate it will be introduced in the House and every effort will be made to get it through before the 2d day of February.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I think I ought to say, with the permission of the Senator who has the floor, that the subject matter of the legislation which has just been mentioned by the Senator from Kansas, and to which the Senator from New Jersey referred, is a very large one; and I have not the slightest idea that such a measure can be considered and disposed of by either or both Houses of Congress prior to the date upon which it is proposed that this final vote shall be taken. In all justice to every interest and issue involved in this matter it can not be expected that legislation revising the postal rates on second-class mail matter—a subject bitterly controverted and occasioning intense dispute—can be acted upon between now and the 2d of February.

Mr. EDGE. But, Mr. President, at least we can make the effort, and practically, I think, we will have just a little more stimulus in making the effort by adopting this course.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I ask the Senator, then, this question? If on the 2d of February it appears that little or no progress has been made with the bill to which he has referred,



providing for revision of the rates on second-class mail matter, what effect would that have on the vote on the postal employees' salary bill?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, of course, I can not answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas, so far as effect is concerned, but under the unanimous-consent agreement the vote on the salary bill must be taken.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I ask the Senator another question? Mr. EDGE. The Senator may.

Mr. ROBINSON. In the Senator's opinion and the opinion of others interested in the final disposition of this veto message and the bill involved in it, is it true that the fate of the bill is intimately associated with the enactment of additional legislation prior to the passage of the postal employees' salary bill?

Mr. EDGE. I would not put it just that way, because I do not know. I am not prepared to answer the question directly. I can only repeat what I have said before, that the two are so intimately related that I assume, and I am sure the Senator would assume, that some Senators and some Members of the House—many, perhaps—would feel better satisfied if the revenue was produced with which to meet this additional salary or at least an effort made to produce it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does not the Senator agree with me that it is practically certain that the bill to which he has referred as raising additional revenue in the Postal Service will not be passed by the 2d of February?

Mr. EDGE. I feel very doubtful as to whether it will be passed or not; but if the effort has been made, we will be certainly moving in the direction of trying to solve that problem. I, of course, can not tell whether it will be passed or not.

Mr. ROBINSON. It may be suggested as worthy of consideration that if the bill is to be postponed in order to give an opportunity to pass other legislation, and that legislation is not passed, its failure may be urged as a reason for the final defeat of the legislation. I make that suggestion.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, if the motion is made to take up the bill for consideration at the earliest opportunity and the bill is passed over the President's veto there will be an added incentive to pass the bill to raise revenue. Is not that a fact?

Mr. EDGE. Does the Senator want to assume the responsibility of having a vote at an early date?

Mr. DILL. The Senator, if he had his way, would have had a vote on the second day of this session. The Senator is not in favor of postponing this thing until the administration can line up enough men against it to defeat it.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator, who as the sponsor of the bill has been given the mistaken title of assuming charge of the bill, wants to see the bill a law, and he believes that this method is the surest way of reaching that result.

I hope the unanimous-consent agreement will receive the approval of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he takes his seat? The Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kansas have both said that a bill was going to be introduced, either here or in the House, to increase the revenue, based upon a report recently received from the department. As we all know, that means second-class mail matter. Are the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Kansas going to advocate an increase in the rates on second-class mail matter?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas will pass upon the measure when it is presented.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not think the Senator would say that, and I do not believe either Senator is going to vote in favor of increasing the rates on second-class mail matter; so we are doing a useless thing in postponing the matter.

Mr. EDGE. I might observe that however the Senator from Kansas or the Senator from New Jersey may vote, it does not in the slightest degree change the status of this veto message. The vote through this agreement is definitely provided for, and the Senators will have an opportunity to vote for or against it. As it is to-day, it is not definitely provided for. I can make my motion and will make my motion, and what will happen to the motion I, of course, do not know.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey a question?

Mr. EDGE. The Senator may.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think the Senator is perfectly within his rights in refusing to commit himself on what he will do when certain legislation comes before the Senate; but I want to ask the Senator if the legislation contemplates increasing the rate on newspapers? Is that the bill that is in contemplation?

Mr. EDGE. I have not seen a copy of the contemplated bill, and have not the slightest knowledge of its provisions. I can answer the Senator only from general recollection of the recommendations made to our committee last spring, when we were considering this general subject. At that time there was, as I recall, provision made for a gradual increase in practically all of the classes provided for, except first class.

Mr. CARAWAY. May I just add that I certainly hope the Senator will be in charge of the legislation. I presume he will be.

Mr. EDGE. No; the Senator will not be in charge of the legislation. He has retired from the Post Office Committee and is busy in other directions.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am expressing the hope that there will be no attempt to make it impossible for people who happen to live a bit remote from the places of publication of newspapers to have an opportunity to read them. I hope there will be no contemplation of trying to make it more expensive to get daily papers. They have become not a luxury but a necessity.

Mr. EDGE. I might point out to the Senator from Arkansas, in connection with his observation in regard to the rates, that the Post Office Department reports a profit of over \$80,000,000 in handling first-class matter; so that can be given careful consideration by the committee in considering revenue-increasing measures.

Mr. COUZENS and Mr. REED of Missouri addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. EDGE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I think this matter may as well be disposed of now, because I shall object to this unanimous-consent agreement until I know something about how the revenue is proposed to be raised. I am heartily in favor of the revenue being raised from the increase in rates on second-class matter before agreeing to postpone the consideration of this bill until February 2, and I shall object.

Mr. DILL. We have no assurance that there will be any legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. There is nothing before the Senate. The Senator from New York is entitled to the floor.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from New York, as the matter just under discussion may come up again, I should like to say just a word about it. I think it is not hard to see through it.

To-day, if we are called on to vote, we will vote on the plain question whether the veto shall be sustained or not sustained. If you postpone it 30 days and hook it up with a proposition to raise the rates of postage upon second-class matter, when the veto message comes before us with that other bill not yet disposed of you will have every, or nearly every, newspaper in the country here fighting the proposition, because it will be proposed to make them pay, by increased postage, for the increases in the salary. Now, if I wanted to sustain the President's veto, the first thing I would do would be to get with me in that fight a lot of men who would be financially interested and who would be put in the position of saying, "In order to raise this revenue you are going to tax us unjustly," and inject into the question the whole problem of whether the rates on second-class matter ought to be raised, and debate that question. It is perfectly plain to me that this is a very fine way to get a great force at work to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I do not quite understand the argument in that regard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. It would seem to follow logically that if we propose an increase of rates on certain classes of mail matter for the purpose of raising revenue then these very interests of which the Senator speaks would be in favor of passing the bill over the veto so that there would be no necessity for increasing the rates in order to raise the revenue.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If we raise the wages of these men by the bill which has been vetoed, we must have more revenue, so it is stated. Now it is proposed that we shall postpone action upon the veto until the bill has been introduced to raise the revenue; it will not have been passed by the 2d day of

February. When you will have that situation, every man who is opposed to paying the increased revenue for hauling his papers or his magazines will want to see the veto of the President sustained, so that there will be no necessity for him to pay an additional rate. I think that ought to be plain enough to be understood. Under those circumstances the friends of this measure ask to have a consent of this kind granted.

Moreover, while my friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] very properly says that he will not commit himself upon a bill until he has seen it, he is nevertheless asking us to commit ourselves on this bill in consideration of the fact that a bill which he says he does not know whether he will support or not is going to be introduced and passed; when it will not be passed in the Senate by the 2d of February, with the opposition of the Senator from Kansas, who is the leader on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. COPELAND. I am still yielding.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I will be through in a moment.

Mr. EDGE. How does the Senator from Missouri figure out that there would be less of a vote to override the veto on February 2 if the suggested revenue bill fails? How could it in the slightest degree, according to his logic—

Mr. REED of Missouri. It is not going to fail; it is going to be pending right here.

Mr. EDGE. Assuming that it fails, or that it shall not have passed, how would it change the mind of a Senator who felt that the salary increase was justified and had so recorded himself at the last session of Congress? How would it in the slightest degree influence him to vote against the veto? He would vote against it to-day, would he not, just as much as he would February 2? Conditions are the same to-day as they would be then, according to the Senator's statement.

Mr. REED of Missouri. If he votes on it to-day, he votes to increase the salaries, and the money will have to be obtained from some place, if it is not already available here. I strongly suspect it is already available. I strongly suspect this is a mere subterfuge somebody got up for the purpose of killing this measure. But we can vote on the measure now on its merits. Then we can fight out the question hereafter of where the money is to come from. But I will answer the Senator's question in this way: the moment you say that we are going to take it out of the publisher of second-class matter, that moment the second-class matter publisher will be here. He is going to see Senators, and he is going to say, "You propose to penalize the press of this country for the purpose of paying this increase and we protest against it," and the result of it will be that the newspaper man will have his friends and his influence here. If you leave him out of the question by voting on this thing now, he will not be here, in all probability.

Mr. EDGE. Where does the Senator propose to secure the income?

Mr. REED of Missouri. I propose to pass on that question when we get to it. Here we have this singular situation. We are blandly asked to put this proposition over in order that a bill may be introduced here, and introduced in the House if necessary, and then the Senator from Kansas, the distinguished leader on the Republican side, tells us that he does not know whether he is going to support it or not. That is not the kind of an assurance on which I propose to submit to the delay in voting upon this bill.

More than that, I have been in the Senate long enough to know what presidential influence means, when you can have about 30 days in which to work on the sensibilities of Members, and we must not forget that we have had a recent example of disciplinary methods being employed for Members of the Senate who have had the temerity to differ from an administration. It can not be forgotten that for failure to support the President in the election two or three very distinguished Republicans have been led by the ear to the door and incontinently kicked out of the Republican holy of holies.

So I am wondering now what is going to be the fate of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I believe he was one of the leaders in the expulsion movement of these men. Because they voted against the President in the election, they are excommunicated and can sit no longer with the brothers. Yet here is my friend from New Jersey, who voted for that action and supported it, so I am informed, who proposes to tell us now that he is strong enough to stand steadfast for 30 days in his purpose to vote against his President upon a veto here in the Senate. I am astounded at his courage and temerity.

Mr. DILL. Does not the Senator think there is a twilight zone into which some of these Senators might be placed, instead of being cast into outer darkness?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. COPELAND. I think I will continue my short speech.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York declines to yield.

Mr. EDGE. If I may have the indulgence of the Senator—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York declines to yield.

#### MUSCLE SHOALS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 518) to authorize and direct the Secretary of War, for national defense in time of war and for the production of fertilizers and other useful products in time of peace, to sell to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, nitrate plant No. 1, at Sheffield, Ala.; nitrate plant No. 2, at Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Waco Quarry, near Russellville, Ala.; steam power plant to be located and constructed at or near Lock and Dam No. 17 on the Black Warrior River, Ala., with right of way and transmission line to nitrate plant No. 2, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; and to lease to Henry Ford, or a corporation to be incorporated by him, Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 (as designated in H. Doc. 1262, 64th Cong., 1st sess.), including power stations when constructed as provided herein, and for other purposes.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, my speech really has not amounted to much this afternoon, but at least my possession of the floor, and my yielding spirit, have made it possible for my colleagues to carry on considerable debate. I am disposed now to finish my remarks relating to Muscle Shoals. I think that was the subject under consideration when we broke off to take up the debate on other matters.

The discussion of the chemistry involved in the making of fertilizer, and the interruptions of various Senators to express opinions on this particular subject, indicate to me more than ever the fact that we need more time to consider this great project.

I think it would be most unfortunate, Mr. President, simply because we do not know what else to do with Muscle Shoals, to lease it for 50 years. It is possible that out of that plant there might grow some development of the fertilizer project, that out of that plant might grow a guaranty of sufficient fixed nitrogen to make explosives. But if this property were to go into private hands any research carried on for the cheapening of fertilizer would be the property of some private corporation. It would not belong to the Government.

So, Mr. President, I hope that out of this discussion may come some agreement in the Senate, not necessarily to adopt the bill presented by the chairman of the committee but either to accept that bill, with such provisos as are necessary to make it a workable bill from every standpoint, or else to strike from the substitute offered by the Senator from Alabama the section which provides for leasing the property.

We have made progress in the development of the fertilizer business and we will continue to make progress. The country needs cheap fertilizer. Everybody agrees that it can be made at Muscle Shoals. Both the bills provide for the making of it there, but I think we ought to proceed under some plan which will make certain that all the progress which is made, all the inventions which grow out of the operation of this property, shall be owned by the citizens of our country. It is necessary for the development of the farm lands that we shall have this cheap fertilizer. We do not want to put this in private hands so that ultimately there may be some question as to the price which may be charged for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose the Underwood substitute shall be agreed to and the public utilities commission of the State of Alabama should fix a rate which would make it profitable for the Alabama Power Co. to use all of the power in the State of Alabama, assuming the Alabama Power Co. should get the plant. How much power to regulate would the State utilities commission of any other State have? In other words, if the amendment is agreed to as it is now the only public utilities commission in the Union with power to regulate prices would be the Alabama State utilities commission, of course. It could not be regulated by other commissions until the power actually got into other States. So what we would be doing would be to take this great national asset and turn it over to



the State of Alabama, and then, if the company ever wanted to use it outside of Alabama, the other State commissions would have some power over it, but until it was used out of the State of Alabama no other commission would have any power to regulate, of course. That would follow, certainly. So that what we would be doing by this amendment, if we agreed to it, would be to turn over this great national project to the State of Alabama first, and if all of the power were used in that State no other State would have any right to it at all.

Mr. COPELAND. In reply to the Senator from Tennessee I can only speak for myself. I am here to say that so far as I am concerned I shall never vote for the bill until there is inserted in it a proviso that the rates shall be fixed, no matter whether the power is used in Alabama or somewhere else, and at present we have no such assurance.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator means by the United States Government?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; and written into the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, of course.

Mr. COPELAND. These questions all indicate what I have referred to time and time again, that the Senate has not determined, has not crystallized its thought, is not ready to settle the question. So I say, let us go ahead, let the War Department finish the property, finish the dam and develop these plants. Let the Agricultural Department go on with its experimentations, and then two or three years from now or five years from now we will not be tied up with a lease running for 50 years, taking out of the hands of our people the benefits to be derived from the operation of the plant, and will be free then to make suitable disposition of the property. I hope that the Senate will exercise wisdom in dealing with the project. Let it be completed by the Government, for the time being let it be operated by the Government, and in that way we will be guaranteed a supply of power, we will be guaranteed a supply of fertilizer, we will be guaranteed a supply of nitrogen for the purpose of making explosives. The Government and the people will be protected. We will not be tied up with a lease which we may regret six months after the contract is entered into. For my part I beg the Senate not to take any hasty action which would result in a lease for a long period of time to private interests and the deprivation on the part of the people of their rights in the matter of this great project at Muscle Shoals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May we have the amendments stated again?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendments proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

The reading clerk read as follows:

On page 2 strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof "also Dams Nos. 2 and 3, located in the Tennessee River at Muscle Shoals, power plants, auxiliary steam plants, all hydroelectric and operating appurtenances."

On page 4, after line 14, transpose section 8 of the substitute.

On page 4, line 20, strike out "being" and insert in lieu thereof "shall be."

On page 4 strike out line 25, and through the period in line 6 on page 5, and insert in lieu thereof "The lessee shall pay as the annual rental for use of such properties an amount not less than 4 per cent of the total amount expended by the United States in acquisition, construction, and completion of Dams Nos. 2 and 3, and the purchase and emplacement of all machinery, gates, or other metal parts or material used in the construction of locks, dams, and power houses."

On page 5, line 10, strike out "said Dam No. 2 and," and insert in lieu thereof "Dams Nos. 2 and 3 and for."

On page 5, line 14, strike out "Dam No. 2" and insert in lieu thereof "as soon as practicable Dams Nos. 2 and 3."

On page 5, line 17, after "into," strike out through "lease," in line 18, and insert "and such property is turned over to the lessee in accordance with the terms of the lease, the lessee shall maintain such property."

On page 9, line 7, strike out "Dam No. 2" and insert in lieu thereof "Dams Nos. 2 and 3."

On page 9, line 8, strike out "plant" and insert in lieu thereof "plants."

On page 12, line 10, strike out all after the period through the period in line 14.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that the amendments were drawn in collaboration with the draftsmen and are merely for the purpose of adding Dam No. 3 to the scheme. The 4 per cent interest is not to be figured on Dam No. 3 until Dam No. 3 is delivered to the lessee. I have sub-

mitted the amendments to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and I think they meet his approval.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say that I understand the Senator's main amendment; he merely transposes my provision in reference to Dam No. 3 from the latter part of the bill to page 4 of the bill. There is one amendment I want to ask him about, however. I do not think there is any question that the provision just referred to where it stands relates to the lessee just as well as it does to the corporation, but some Senators have raised the question that if it is in the latter part of the bill it may relate only to the corporation and not to the lessee. I do not care to have any doubt about that proposition. I intend that it should relate both to the lessee and to the corporation, and therefore I have no objection to that amendment. That is merely a technical proposition.

The real proposition is that, although I provide for the authorization and not the appropriation for the building of Dam No. 3, I did not provide for its cooperation with Dam No. 2, because if it was not built I merely provided that Congress should hereafter provide the necessary legislation. The Senator from Mississippi in his amendment seeks to provide that when completed it shall cooperate with the same work, whether lessee or corporation, on Dam No. 2. Personally I have no objection to that. I did not put it in my amendment because I did not want to overload the bill. I thought it might create some objection, but if the Senate wants it in there is no objection on my part at all. I have never had any objection to that provision. It is merely a question as to whether we shall act now or later on, and I am perfectly willing to act now.

The question I desire to propound is as to the amendment proposed on page 5. The balance of the amendments are merely changing where it reads "Dam No. 2" to read "Dams Nos. 2 and 3" throughout the bill, to make the main amendment of the Senator conform to the language of the bill. However, on page 5, line 17, it now reads:

That after the lease is entered into the lessee shall maintain the property covered by lease in good repair and working condition for the term of the contract.

I do not exactly understand what change the Senator desires to make at that point.

Mr. HARRISON. It strikes out after the word "into" down to the word "lease," in line 18, which would be striking out the words "the lessee shall maintain the property covered by the lease," and inserts the words "and such property is turned over to the lessee in accordance with the terms of the lease, the lessee shall maintain such property."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Without saying anything about "in good repair and working condition"?

Mr. HARRISON. It leaves that language in. That is left just as it is now. I put in the words "and such property is turned over to the lessee in accordance with the terms of the lease," and so forth. I have not omitted the part the Senator wanted in there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is all right, then.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator simply adds the words "in accordance with the terms of the lease."

Mr. HARRISON. That is all.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, the proviso that is added on page 2 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, having reference to page 4 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], would strike out line 25 thereof, and so forth. Then it will be noticed that, beginning with line 18 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi, there are certain lines stricken out and this language substituted therefor:

*Provided*, That the rental for said dams, or either of them, hereinbefore provided for shall become operative upon their delivery to the lessee ready for operation.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will permit me, I have modified my amendment, and the words "ready for operation" are stricken out. I did it in the hope that it might remove the objection the Senator has. It now reads:

*Provided*, That the rental for said dams, or either of them, heretofore provided for shall become operative upon their delivery to the lessee.

Mr. HOWELL. But the question is, What is the condition of the dams to be when turned over? Let us consider Dam No. 2. There is a provision in the design for 18 penstocks, with turbines and the electrical generators in connection therewith. Only eight power units are being installed. However, the eight that are being provided will generate 260,000 hydroelectric horsepower. Remember, that the primary power of this dam

is only 100,000 horsepower. It might occur that the lessee would not want to accept Dam No. 2 until it was entirely completed, with each of the 18 penstocks provided with turbines and electrical machinery. I can see very plainly how the contract might be so drawn that the lessees could refuse to accept the property until such a time, and would not be responsible for the rental until then.

I think it ought to be made very clear that what we are turning over to the lessee is what Congress has thus far made provision for; that is, a combined water power and steam plant capable of producing 200,000 primary horsepower. The Muscle Shoals enterprise has cost about \$150,000,000 and I feel, inasmuch as we are to turn over this much property at the outset to the lessee, there ought to be nothing in the lease contract that would bind the United States to put another dollar into the property unless Congress should subsequently see fit to do so. We ought not now to tie the hands of Congress in any contract to construct Dam No. 3 and equip Dam No. 2 with the additional 10 power units until we see what the lessee will proceed to do with the dam equipped for the development of 260,000 horsepower.

This is a mere business proposition. Congress can not justify itself in handling the matter any differently from the way in which any Member of the Senate would handle it if he as owner were dealing with a prospective lessee. Under the amended amendment as now proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] it is provided that no fertilizer need be made for two years. In the third year 10,000 tons of fixed nitrogen must be made; in the fourth year 20,000 tons of fixed nitrogen; in the fifth year 30,000 tons; and in the sixth year and annually thereafter 40,000 tons. If we turn over this property that has cost \$150,000,000, with 200,000 primary horsepower, sufficient time will elapse before more power is needed for fertilizer purposes to enable Congress to determine whether the lessee is carrying out the contract in the spirit in which Congress expects it to be carried out. I am sure that if any one of the Senators here present owned this great plant and was about to lease it, he would not put a provision into the contract that bound him to expend \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 more when he did not know exactly what would be necessary, and could not know until after the contractor had the plant in operation for four or five years.

To meet this situation I have provided an amendment as follows:

That nothing in this contract shall bind the United States Government to construct Dam No. 3.

We ought to have our hands free. The contractor ought not to be in a position to stand back and say to us, irrespective of how he fulfills his contract, "You must build Dam No. 3."

Do the Senators realize that this proposal does not provide under what conditions the proposed lease would be forfeited or terminated? If the contractor fails to carry out the terms of the lease, what is the remedy of the United States Government? A suit at law for damages under the provisions of the contract as stipulated in the substitute offered by the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Alabama, nor I, would not make such a contract as that for ourselves.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him for just a moment, I will say that there is no provision in regard to the forfeiture of the lease in my substitute, except that the lease is to be forfeited if, under the terms of the contract, the contractor does not make the nitrogen and fertilizer. I take it that when the Secretary of War and the President make the lease they will provide the proper terms for its forfeiture.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I remember that Congress passed an amendment to an act that made a grave impression upon my mind when first I came upon the floor of the Senate last session, and that was for the lease of the naval oil reserves. Senators here admitted, when they reread that amendment, that proper safeguards had not been inserted; that the Secretary of the Navy probably had the authority to lease those oil reserves as he did; and criticism of the Senate was expressed by Members of this body because of the fact that such a loosely drawn law had been enacted. Should the Senate of the United States after so short a period forget that lesson?

We are nothing but a board of directors, and when we lay down premises respecting a lease to be made, and limit those premises, what can we expect that an administrative officer will understand? That we intended that the lease should be on such terms, if he could do no better? If we should turn this matter over to the President with power to act, and not limit

him as to how he should act, then the responsibility would lie wholly on the President. He would then be on his guard to make such a lease as could not be criticized. We are dividing responsibility in partially indicating how this lease should be drawn. If we prescribe any provisions whatever, we should incorporate all that are vital and which can be introduced in this measure without the slightest trouble or complication.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOWELL. I will.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As the substitute is now written, as I stated a while ago, there is an authorization for the building of Dam No. 3, but it is not in any way whatever tied up with this lease. If the Senator will observe the provision in reference to it it is a mere authorization. Probably, in order to make it entirely clear, I had myself better read the paragraph to the Senator. It is on page 15, and reads:

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to complete the construction of Dam No. 3 in the Tennessee River at or near Muscle Shoals, Ala., in accordance with report submitted in House Document 1262, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may in his discretion make such modifications in the plans presented in such report as he may deem advisable in the interest of power or navigation.

SEC. 9. That upon the completion of Dam No. 3 by the United States, the dam, power plants, machinery, and appurtenances thereto shall be leased or operated in conjunction with Dam No. 2 as provided for in this act on such terms as Congress shall hereafter provide.

So that there is no power, as the substitute now stands, for the President to include Dam No. 3 in the contract which he is authorized to make.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just a moment. The proposal of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is to put Dam No. 3 in the contract. The measure as it stands has that question guarded, because it is still in the power of the Congress.

Mr. HOWELL. I am speaking of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, if we should put Dam No. 3 in, then it would come within the terms of the contract; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. HOWELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if he would be willing to accept an amendment as follows. On page 16, line 5, after the word "provide" to insert the following:

But no contract herein provided for shall bind the United States to construct said Dam No. 3.

Would the Senator from Alabama be willing to accept this amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should very much prefer not to have the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi go in on those terms, because those terms are not necessary as the substitute now stands. I think it would leave the whole matter in so nebulous a state that a contractor would not under those circumstances know as to whether or not he was going to get Dam No. 3, and he could not, therefore, make a bid; in other words, he might make a bid that was not commensurate with the value of Dam No. 3. That would leave the situation open where the lessee would be entirely at sea as to what he was bidding for, because it would be left for the future action of Congress.

Mr. HOWELL. Then, as I understand, if the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi is not adopted in the form offered, the amendment of the Senator from Alabama would not bind the United States Government to construct Dam No. 3?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not mean that; but in my amendment Dam No. 3 has nothing to do with the contract; there is a mere authorization looking to the future. In other words, the contract which is provided for in the substitute has nothing to do with Dam No. 3.

Mr. HOWELL. Would the Senator from Alabama object to putting in the words:

But no contract herein provided for shall bind the United States to construct Dam No. 3?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, I am trying to put in an authorization which will require the coming back here to get the money. Then, if the money is provided and Dam No. 3 is completed, I provide that it shall be put in operation with Dam No. 2 only on such terms as Congress shall hereafter provide. If my substitute stands as it is, there will be no necessity whatever for the language which the Senator seeks to have inserted.

Mr. HOWELL. Assuming there is no necessity, would it do any harm?



Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator wants to provide, if the substitute stands as it is, that Dam No. 3 is not to be within the terms of the contract, it would make no difference, but I see no reason for it, because when the substitute provides "on such terms as Congress hereafter shall provide," it makes it perfectly clear that nothing can be done, not with its building, but with its operation, until Congress shall so provide. The language the Senator would use would negative the question of authorization.

Mr. HOWELL. I beg pardon; not at all. All that I propose by my amendment is that no contractor can come forward and urge that he understood that under the terms of this statute when enacted he was also to have Dam No. 3; in other words, that he could call upon Congress to construct Dam No. 3. I believe that we ought not to bind ourselves in any way to do it. We can later go ahead and do it if we want to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator means as far as the contractor is concerned?

Mr. HOWELL. As far as the contractor is concerned.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is nothing in my bill as it stands now that would authorize a contract to be made with anybody about Dam No. 3. Of course, if the Senator's provision is adopted, then there would be authority. That is the reason why he is putting it in—because mine does not. My provisions do not authorize the consideration of Dam No. 3 in the contract. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is proposing to put it in, so that it will come within the terms of the contract; but if it does come within the terms of the contract I do not think you would get a contract if you said to the lessee, "You may make a contract about this, but you do not know whether you are going to get Dam No. 3 or not." I do not think that could be done effectively.

Mr. HOWELL. But the Senator's bill provides that if Dam No. 3 is constructed the contractor shall have Dam No. 3.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it does not; and if there is any doubt in the Senator's mind in regard to section 9 I should very much prefer to have him move to strike out section 9 and just let the authorization stand, which does not dispose of it at all, rather than to put in language which may be confusing.

That upon the completion of Dam No. 3 by the United States the dam, power plants, machinery, and appurtenances thereto shall be leased—

Not now, but after their completion; it contemplates a future lease.

Mr. HOWELL. But it is to the same contractor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It provides that they—

shall be leased or operated in conjunction with Dam No. 2 as provided for in this act on such terms as Congress shall hereafter provide.

The contractor can not get anything out of that or can not contract in reference to it until Congress hereafter passes a law.

Mr. HOWELL. I understand that; but suppose Congress built the dam and the contractor said, "We will not agree with the provisions that you make." Are you going to let the dam stand idle and do nothing with it?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; then Congress could provide for its sale or operation in some other manner.

Mr. HOWELL. The contractor might go into court and say, "Under this contract I understood that I was to have Dam No. 3, and now Congress makes the terms so onerous that I can not take it over."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that I am not wedded to section 9. If the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] goes through, then, of course, I think his amendment would destroy what the Senator is trying to do.

If it does not go through and the Senator is desirous of having section 9 stricken out, I do not object to it. I only want the authorization. If he thinks that stands in the way, I should prefer to strike it out than to put in the language that he has.

Mr. HOWELL. As this particular feature is not before the Senate now I should like to have an opportunity to consider this matter and take it up later.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate ought to consider particularly what this property is, its present condition, and the arrangements that have been made for its completion, so that there may be nothing in this measure that could in any way bind the United States to install the 10 additional power units in connection with Dam No. 2, because the units already provided for can develop 260,000 horsepower. Therefore we should be extremely careful about adopting an amendment of this kind, offered by the Senator from Mississippi

[Mr. HARRISON], which might defer the time when a lessee would begin to pay for the use of this property on the ground that these additional 10 power units had not been installed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to the substitute offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. HARRISON obtained the floor.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he will accept and add to his amendment the words which I send to the desk.

Mr. HARRISON. Let the language be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the matter referred to.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to insert a new section, as section 6, to read as follows:

In order to provide for a larger amount of primary power to be developed on the Tennessee River, if a suitable site or sites can be found upon investigation where practical storage reservoirs can be obtained at reasonable cost, the Secretary of War is directed to take the necessary steps to secure such sites and to build the necessary dams for the impounding of water therein. If the Secretary of War, under authority of this act, constructs one or more dams for the purpose of impounding the waters of said river, he shall give due consideration in the construction of such dams to the development of hydroelectric power, to the necessities of navigation, and flood control.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi modify his amendment as suggested?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am so vitally interested in the other amendment that I am perfectly willing to accept this proposition. I believe it is carrying out a general scheme that should be carried out; but if there are some objections to it, and if it should complicate my amendment, I should not want to modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I think the Senator had better disagree to the suggestion. I think we ought to have some limit to this thing.

Mr. HARRISON. If there is objection, very well.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to take just a few moments upon my amendment.

I thought the objection of the Senator from Nebraska was to the wording of the proviso with respect to turning over these dams to the lessee; but I find that his objection goes to the root of the proposition, and what he is objecting to is incorporating Dam No. 3 with Dam No. 2 in making the lease. So I differ absolutely with the Senator on that proposition, and therefore I was a little surprised at what he said. Now let us see about this proposition.

Every bid that has been made to the Secretary of War to carry on this development, except that of the Union Carbide people, has incorporated Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3. Ford, the Alabama Power Co., the Hooker and Atterbury people, all the bidders except the Union Carbide Co. have incorporated Dam No. 2 with Dam No. 3. I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] would agree that the two propositions should be incorporated.

May I say that if you are going to obligate a lessee, according to the Underwood proposal, to manufacture 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen annually, and you do not place Dam No. 3 in this contract, it will be absolutely impossible for them to carry out the terms of the proposition. They can not mix the nitrogen and the phosphoric acid on the amount of power that would be developed from Dam No. 2 alone.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will just let me proceed for a few minutes to make myself clear, I shall appreciate it.

There is the map, drawn by the experts and not contradicted, showing that in order to develop 241,000 primary horsepower at Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 you must employ at least two steam plants—the steam plant that was located at the Gorgas plant, which has now been sold, and the steam plant at nitrate plant No. 2. Indeed, there is 120,000 horsepower that is developed from steam power; and if you take Dam No. 2 and Dam No. 3 together, excluding the steam power developed, you get only 121,000 primary horsepower. The experts say that in order to make 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen annually, fertilizers of every kind, mixing it with the phosphoric acid and the various other elements according to the Underwood proposal—because it says you have to furnish fertilizers, mixed and unmixed, of every kind—it will take 257,000 primary horsepower. If you do not incorporate in this proposition Dam No. 3, it will be impossible for a person who bids upon the proposition to carry out the

terms of the proposal. So I submit that whatever is done in this legislation, Dam No. 3 should be incorporated in it.

I do not change the wording of this proposal one iota from the provisions that are embodied in Dam No. 2 by incorporating Dam No. 3. The rentals of 4 per cent annually are not to apply until the dam is delivered to the particular lessee, if a lease shall be made. So I submit, Mr. President, that this amendment should be adopted if we want to make this thing a success at all.

Mr. JONES of Washington obtained the floor.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska. I understand that he desires to ask unanimous consent for a reprint.

Mr. HOWELL. I do desire to ask for a reprint of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]; and, in addition, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Mississippi. Does the Senator understand that under the terms of the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] it will be incumbent upon the lessee to manufacture phosphoric acid?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; fertilizers of every kind, mixed and unmixed.

Mr. HOWELL. I am talking about phosphoric acid.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator will just permit me, I have no doubt in the world that if we had left in the wording which was stricken out yesterday, "according to demand," it would have incorporated phosphoric acid, because the words were put in there at the instance of the Committee on Agriculture of the House on request of Mr. Ford to meet that very situation—that whatever the farmers demanded in fertilizer up to that which might be made out of 40,000 tons of fixed nitrogen, whether it was phosphoric acid or sulphate of ammonia or what not, it should be made—and I think yet that the words "according to demand" should be reincorporated in this bill, and then there would be no question in the world about it. I do not think there is any question about it now, and I know you will not have any phosphoric acid if Dam No. 3 is not incorporated.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think that if the word "demand" had been transposed and made to refer to what the Senator from Mississippi has just said—that on demand of the farmers for certain kinds, it should be furnished—it would be all right; but where it was placed it left doubt as to what was meant.

Mr. HARRISON. It may be that the language was ambiguous.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. But the idea, the intention of it, was that it should meet the demands of the farmers for the kind of fertilizer that they demanded and required.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; but the word was unfortunately placed in the sentence, and I think it ought to be restored at the proper place, so as to carry out the idea that it should be on demand of the farmer.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I would like further to ask the Senator from Mississippi respecting phosphoric acid. Unless compelled to make phosphoric acid a lessee will not require the amount of horsepower which the Senator has just suggested.

Mr. HARRISON. That is quite true. The figures I gave—257,000 primary horsepower—included the question of producing phosphoric acid.

Mr. HOWELL. The Senator thinks they ought to make phosphoric acid?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

Mr. HOWELL. I intend to offer an amendment, and would like to have the Senator's support. I propose to offer an amendment providing that phosphoric acid shall be produced equal to at least two and one-half times the tonnage of fixed nitrogen provided for. That would provide merely for 3-8-3 fertilizer.

Mr. HARRISON. I would want to look into that proposition, because that might not be enough phosphoric acid.

Mr. HOWELL. I am willing to increase the amount of phosphoric acid. Of course, if it were 2-8-2, it would have to be 4 tons of phosphoric acid to 1 ton of fixed nitrogen.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator and myself are driving toward the same goal.

Mr. HOWELL. We certainly are; but I do not think this substitute, as now worded, requires the lessee to make phosphoric acid.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator wait and hold that question, and allow this amendment to be adopted? Then

we can fight out that question, and I for one shall certainly join with him in the proposition. I want to see phosphoric acid made there, and if the words "according to demand" had not been stricken out, I have no doubt in the world that it would have been.

Mr. HOWELL. I would agree with the Senator respecting Dam No. 3 if it were not for this fact: The manager of the Alabama Power Co. has testified that when the Muscle Shoals project is completed, and ready to deliver 200,000 primary horsepower, steam-electric and hydroelectric, that this development on the Tennessee River combined with the development on the Tallapoosa River, each supplementing the other, that the primary horsepower of Muscle Shoals will be increased 150,000 horsepower; furthermore, that the primary horsepower on the Tallapoosa River will be increased 64,000 horsepower.

It must be very apparent that it is not necessary to build Dam No. 3 in order to get 257,000 horsepower, because the plant on the Tallapoosa River is to be finished in 1926. With the primary power now provided for at Muscle Shoals, and the 75 per cent increase due to the combination of this development with the Tallapoosa project, the primary power at Muscle Shoals would be increased from 200,000 to 350,000 horsepower. That is why I do not think it is necessary for Congress to bind itself at this time in this contract to build Dam No. 3, until we find out what the lessee will do with this 350,000 horsepower that will be available in the next two years.

Mr. HARRISON. Will not the Senator allow us to take a vote on my amendment to-night?

Mr. HOWELL. I have asked that my amendment be printed.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] stated that he desired to speak at some length on the amendment. So it is evident that the Senate can not dispose of this amendment to-night. Has the order for a reprint of the amendment, asked for by the Senator from Nebraska, been made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day, it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously made, took a recess until to-morrow, Friday, December 12, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11 (legislative day of December 10), 1924*

##### GOVERNOR OF THE PANAMA CANAL

Col. Meriwether L. Walker to be Governor of the Panama Canal.

##### MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL FARM LOAN BOARD

Albert Calvin Williams to be a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

##### POSTMASTERS

###### LOUISIANA

Estelle S. Keller, Collinston.  
Edna Byrd, Glenmora.  
William C. Reynolds, Ida.  
Edith E. Steckler, Jeanerette.  
Octave H. Deshotels, Kaplan.  
Albert A. Thoman, Monroe.  
Ophelia L. Willis, Pearl River.  
Frank G. Rieger, Scotlandville.  
Lillie Schexnaider, Sellers.  
Charles W. Page, Shreveport.  
George M. Tannehill, Urania.  
Thomas C. Reagan, sr., Winnaboro.

###### MISSOURI

William Vogel, De Soto.  
Carl W. Hutchison, Leeds.



John F. Burrell, Mountain View.  
Albert L. Brady, Oran.  
Lizzie A. Rademaker, Parma.

## NEBRASKA

Arthur F. Jarman, Ashland.  
Eugene V. Hickok, Atkinson.  
Laura M. Baird, Cairo.  
Earl J. Hughes, Concord.  
Alexander E. Etting, David City.  
Henry L. Nichols, Lebanon.  
William Mankin, Lisco.  
Mamie Mathews, Marsland.  
George W. Whitehead, Mason City.  
Walter I. Farnham, Merna.  
Henry D. Grady, O'Neil.  
Etta H. Bartlett, Potter.  
Margaret Bolan, St. Columbans.  
Olaf H. Larson, Shickley.  
Mabel E. Bigelow, Ulysses.  
Sara I. Barritt, Union.  
George E. Barto, Wakefield.  
Murry K. Holley, Waverly.  
Lillian A. Elliott, Westpoint.  
George H. Holdeman, York.

## NEW YORK

Richard J. Higgins, East Rockaway.  
Clarence J. Weyant, Fort Montgomery.  
Roy M. Hackett, Hornell.  
Edwin W. Cushman, Keuka Park.  
James Agnew, Lake Ronkonkoma.  
Edith L. Kent, Tuxedo Park.  
Anna M. Smith, West Albany.  
Loie C. Husted, Woodhull.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Matilda Peterson, Agar.  
Dana N. Bonesteel, Artesian.  
Nellie M. Sullivan, Athol.  
Ezra J. F. Lamkee, Avon.  
Loretta M. Stromme, Garretson.  
Robert H. Benner, Gary.  
Adam F. Glaser, Herrick.  
Harry O. Starksen, Hetland.  
Harry K. Sanborn, Harley.  
Oscar D. Hansen, Irene.  
Leland K. Stoddard, Parker.  
Fred Chesley, Platte.  
Joseph W. Gibson, Salem.

## VERMONT

Hiram E. Rowe, Barnet.  
William H. C. Whitcomb, Forest Dale.  
Ethel E. Churchill, Quechee.  
Irwin Mattison, South Shaftsbury.  
Otis B. Dauchy, Townshend.  
Kenneth A. Foster, Wolcott.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, December 11, 1924

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of wisdom, God of love, Thou are the way, the truth, the life. Do Thou unite us in knowledge and in purpose that our service to our country may be full of thoughtful consideration. Always keep us in sympathetic touch with human relationships and human needs. Meet us in the way of duty and make it plain and sure. In all the best demands of life may we take our pledge to live and to labor for the good. May we pass through these days with hearts of gladness and with spirits that serve, and thus may we lift some burden, lighten some load, and brighten some way. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 7052. An act for the relief of Geston P. Hunt; and  
H. R. 8687. An act to authorize alterations to certain naval vessels and to provide for the construction of additional vessels.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 10404) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 10404, with Mr. TREADWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill. When the committee rose on Tuesday it had completed the reading of the bill down to and including page 80. The Clerk will resume the reading at page 31.

The Clerk read as follows:

## FOREST SERVICE

## SALARIES

For the Chief Forester and other personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, and for personal services in the field, \$3,325,003.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say what I had intended to say during the general debate. I was unavoidably absent on Tuesday.

As most of the Members of the House know, March 4 will end my public service and this will probably be the last time I shall have the privilege of cooperating in the passage of an Agricultural appropriation bill. I do not want to let this occasion pass without expressing my appreciation of the generous and kindly cooperation which I have received at all times from the members of the subcommittee, the members of the Committee on Appropriations, and the Members of the House in general on both sides of the aisle. I particularly want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE], who has taken charge of this bill last year and this year. I appreciate the fact that he has done this under rather difficult circumstances, especially last year, because he had no opportunity for prior preparation, which is so desirable, if not necessary, in conducting a bill through this body.

I should deprive myself of a very great pleasure and my colleagues of a tribute which is due them if I did not say that my contacts and associations with the Members of the committee and the House have been of the most kindly and cordial character. I can not say I leave public life entirely without regrets. I have enjoyed my public service beyond measure, but my chief regret will be in severing the ties and the relationships which I have had with the Members of the committee and the House, and the memory of these relationships and friendships will be among the most treasured memories of my life as I leave this place on March 4. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, it is with profound regret that I contemplate the loss to the public service of the invaluable services of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. It has been my pleasure to have been associated with him in subcommittee work on this bill, and it has been my observation that on every measure he considered only the merits of that measure and the good to result to the country at large from any appropriation made to carry it into effect. In his deliberations upon the committee I can truthfully say that he regarded not sections, he regarded not party, but responded to the impulse of what he conceived to be his duty to act for the best interests of the Nation. The agricultural interests of this country suffer a great loss by reason of his retirement from this House. [Applause.]

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent to proceed out of order for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WASON. Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune during the early days of my membership in this body to be assigned to a committee of which my friend and colleague SYDNEY ANDERSON was a member. From that time until this date circumstances have kept us close together in committee work.

I rise at this time to emphasize every word of praise that has been spoken by Mr. MAGEE of New York and Mr. BUCHANAN of Texas, in behalf of the public service of Mr. ANDERSON. As a member of the committees where I have served with him and under him, I have always found him a genial, courteous, and capable advocate of the best interests of the agricultural development of this country.

He possessed a clear mind, a keen intellect, and it is rarely discovered that any Member of this body understands more clearly the pressing needs and demands of agricultural development than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON].

I personally am sorry that he is to leave us. I regret to think of the day when my friend will not go with us further in helping legislation and providing appropriations in the interests of agricultural development. In his new vocation I know we all wish him the marked success that he has enjoyed during his service in this House and hope that his new activities may be as pleasant and successful as his service here. God speed him in his new work. He leaves with our sincere regrets and our highest esteem and appreciation. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

#### GENERAL EXPENSES, FOREST SERVICE

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building purchased, erected, or as improved shall not exceed \$1,500; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests, including tree planting in the forest reserves to prevent erosion, drift, surface wash, and soil waste, and the formation of floods, and including the payment of rewards under regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury to, Government property; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests, and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests to be exported from the State or Territory in which said forests are respectively situated; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase necessary supplies, apparatus, office fixtures, law books, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington, and for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, and washing towels, and official traveling, and other necessary expenses, including travelling expenses for legal and fiscal officers while performing Forest Service work; and for rent outside of the District of Columbia, as follows:

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and also to insert a brief article by Doctor Coville on experiments in rhododendron culture, which I think is very interesting and relates to the blueberry culture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record and insert an article by Doctor Coville. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, in the hearings before the committee there is some discussion relative to the blueberry industry. It is shown that in one State the value of the crop from the blueberry fields where they grow wild is over \$2,000,000. There is the same situation in other States where the

profuse fruiting of the bushes brings about an interesting and paying industry. There is probably no other wild fruit in our country which grows so freely and produces so abundantly such a delicious fruit. Throughout the South there is the huckleberry, while not of the same plant family is close kin and the fruit is much alike.

It is a matter of serious consideration if a pest has been found which if let alone would destroy this source of food. The hearings before the committee show that a fly is attacking the fruit of the blueberry in certain sections of Maine. It is gratifying to know that the committee has responded to the call of the Department of Agriculture and inserted a provision under which an investigation will be made as well as efforts to destroy this attack.

The blueberry industry, which extends into a great many sections, has been investigated by the Department of Agriculture, and for many years they have experimented with both the blueberry and huckleberry. The results have been most successful. The bulletins published by the Department of Agriculture give details of the series of experiments with blueberry seedlings brought about by hybridization. It will be seen that in the early efforts of experimentation back in 1906, in the limited quarters, there was evidence of great improvement. There were made discoveries of the soil requirements. It was proven that a much larger and more attractive berry could be produced. The work in Washington in the restricted quarters demonstrated there was a promising field for development. The Government expanded the work by leasing a field in New Jersey where, with outdoor space of many acres and favorable soil conditions, there was an opportunity for great development. Different varieties of hybrids were grown and larger berries produced. A group of varieties was produced with favorable bearing qualities. The berries had been increased to a much larger size which can be appreciated when it is stated that they are about the same size as the familiar Concord grape. This was a great accomplishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for three minutes. This is the most eloquent speech I ever heard on the subject of blueberries. [Applause.]

Mr. FISHER. From a wild, fruit-bearing bush our Government experts produced a beautiful, luscious fruit, which will mean much to our markets. Commercial growers are planting orchards to fill a demand which will await them. There is one farm in New Jersey where 50 acres are under cultivation, and a good part of this is producing large quantities of berries which are quickly sold to markets in neighboring cities.

This would indicate the development of a big, paying industry. These experiments resulting in so fine an accomplishment were conducted by Dr. Frederick Coville, of the Bureau of Plant Industry, together with colleagues from other branches of the department, particularly of the Bureau of Soils.

Important and interesting as this valuable contribution is, produced by rare skill in hybridization, it means much to the development of all plant industry, for there was also discovered much knowledge relating to soil requirements. These experiments produced facts which extend to many other interesting plants. For instance, it was found that the blueberry and huckleberry require an acid soil, and that other valuable plants, much prized in the field of horticulture, have the same requirements. In sections of our country where the soil is either neutral or alkali in reaction, the many efforts by gardeners to grow such plants as azaleas, rhododendrons, and kalmia latifolia or mountain laurel have failed. That is a familiar condition in many parts of our country, and the efforts to raise these attractive shrubs have been abandoned.

#### THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A HALF-ROTTED AND A FULL-ROTTED OAK LEAF

Many of these unfortunate experiments are personally known to me, both in my garden as well as my neighbors'. This problem of how to make blueberry, huckleberry, azaleas, and other such plants grow in a soil which is apparently hostile seems to have been solved through these experiments. If acid soil can not be obtained to substitute for the soil with the alkali reaction, then there is recommended the removal of the soil and the substitution of a mixture partly of half-rotted oak leaves (the red oak preferred) with sand at given proportions with the native soil; also other things are suggested to continue and increase the amount of acidity in the soil. These plants when planted according to the directions and well cared for seem to thrive, where theretofore they withered and died. There are also experiments being made



in the use of a chemical. The processes and methods of use are clearly presented in a number of articles written by Dr. Edgar T. Wherry, of the Bureau of Soils, who has been a party to the investigations of the soil needs of the blueberry.

And the most interesting feature of the findings was the discovery that the red oak leaf is a source of help in keeping a naturally nonacid soil in a more nearly acid condition. Everybody is familiar with the red oak. The good fortune is mine to live in a neighborhood where there are many grand red oak trees—in my own yard there is a wonderful twin red oak. The leaf of this tree in the fall is large, brown, and has a leathery look. It is slower to rot than other leaves, and through the process of degenerating, which takes from one to two years, unless aided by different methods, it retains an acid condition which is transmitted to the soil where it is rotting. When the rotting leaf reaches a stage called leaf mold it has somehow changed to an alkali reaction and no longer would it be of value to the plants described, unless mixed with leaves at an earlier stage of decomposition, which is accomplished by adding new leaves from time to time. It is to be understood that there are many beautiful plants which would revel in a supply of any kind of leaf mold and do not require a special soil. All of this adds great interest to those who would welcome a new and attractive fruit and the knowledge given in the findings as to methods of overcoming soil difficulties which have hitherto been almost a bar to the cultivation of many plants in different sections of our country. [Applause.]

Under the leave to extend I insert the following article by Doctor Coville:

EXPERIMENTS IN RHODODENDRON CULTURE  
(By Frederick V. Coville, March 20, 1923)

In the course of a series of experiments with blueberry seedlings, 1906 to 1910, it was found that these plants require an acid soil. (Experiments in blueberry culture, 1910, published as Bulletin 193, Bureau of Plant Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, 100 pages of text, 18 plates, 31 text figures. Now out of print.) The experiments have since been extended to many other plants and it has been shown conclusively that a very large number of species in ornamental horticulture have the same requirement. Lack of success is due to failure to provide them with the acid soil they demand. This is true especially of rhododendrons and nearly all other plants of the heather family, such as azalea, mountain laurel (*Kalmia latifolia*), trailing arbutus (*Epigaea repens*), and heather (*Calluna vulgaris*).

In nature acid nourishment is provided by the accumulation on the surface of the ground of a layer of half-rotted leaves, twigs, and rootlets. Such an accumulation, when it occurs in a sphagnum bog, is called bog peat, or simply peat. On well-drained sandy or gravelly soils it is called upland peat. Under good conditions upland peat is laced into a tenacious mat, a few inches in thickness, by the roots of the ericaceous plants that accompany it, and this mat persists year after year, continually renewing itself through each year's leaf fall and the penetration of new roots into the decaying mass. Upland peat is normally brown, but is often blackened by ground fires.

On limestone soils or on soils which for any reason have an alkaline chemical reaction upland peat does not form. The lime and other alkaline substances in the soil greatly hasten the decomposition of the leaves. Each year's leaf fall is decomposed, much of it passing in liquid form into the underlying soil prior to the leaf fall of the following year. Fully decomposed leaves form a true leaf mold, black in color and neutral or alkaline in reaction, in which rhododendrons and other acid-soil plants will not grow.

The continuation of acidity in upland peat is due to the arrest of decomposition before it has progressed to the alkaline stage, and the chief factor in the arrest is the lack of lime in the soil that underlies the leaves. When an upland peat mat is once established its own acidity is fatal to the life of the organisms that as agents of rapid decay would soon destroy its acidity.

In soils derived from granite, sandstone, sand, and gravel acid conditions are usually maintained with little difficulty by the addition of upland peat, half-rotted oak leaves, or decayed wood or bark.

Sawdust and spent tanbark are acid materials useful as mulch for acid-soil plants. They should be applied experimentally at first, however, to test the safety and suitability of the particular kind that is available. Some kinds of sawdust, notably red cedar and pitch pine, contain, when fresh, substances that are directly injurious. Other kinds, such as basswood, maple, and birch, are free from these substances. In general it is best to use sawdust that is weathered and somewhat decayed.

When an attempt is to be made to grow rhododendrons or other acid-soil plants in a place in which the soil is neutral or alkaline, such as a limestone soil, the bottom land of a river valley, the ordinary fer-

tile garden, or a prairie or arid-region soil, it is necessary to prepare holes or trenches and make up a special soil mixture. This should consist of one part of clean sand to one or two, or even four, parts of upland peat or its equivalent. To keep earthworms from bringing up the underlying soil the bottom of the hole should be lined with a 2-inch layer of soft-coal cinders. The depth of the peat and sand mixture need not be more than 8 to 12 inches. A permanent mulch of oak leaves will help maintain a proper degree of moisture, and by decomposition will add to the peat supply. If the materials for the mixture are available in quantity, a bed may be laid down over the whole surface of the ground.

A sharp distinction should be made between half-rotted oak leaves and the ordinary compost of leaves with manure, garden soil, and garden trash. Such a compost is neutral or alkaline in reaction and should not be used on acid-soil plants. Sugar maple, elm, and linden leaves rot rapidly and so soon reach the alkaline stage that they also are not desirable for application to an acid-soil planting. Oak leaves, especially red-oak leaves, rot slowly, and in two or three years, if the pile is turned over several times, make a good substitute for upland peat. (For a more extended discussion of the decay of leaves and its relation to acid soils see "The formation of leaf mold," Smithsonian Report for 1913, pp. 333 to 343.)

No manure, lime, or wood ashes should be applied to rhododendrons or other plants that require an acid soil, for all these substances tend to neutralize the necessary acidity. Cottonseed meal, ground soy beans, and spent malt, all of which contain a large amount of nitrogen in organic and acid form, are excellent fertilizers for acid-soil plants. In very sandy soils for which so little peat is available that the plants suffer for nourishment the following special acid fertilizer devised for blueberries and cranberries would probably do well for rhododendrons, applied at the rate of an eighth to a fourth of a pound per square yard. (From p. 20 of "Directions for blueberry culture, 1921," Bulletin 974, United States Department of Agriculture, 24 pp. and 29 pls.)

	Pounds
Nitrate of soda	17
Dried blood	23
Steamed bone	34
Phosphate rock	34
Potash	17

A series of greenhouse experiments in the last two years has shown that an ordinary fertile garden or greenhouse soil well suited to roses but fatal to rhododendrons can be acidified by the application of crude aluminum sulphate, and will then nourish rhododendron seedlings almost as well as peat and sand. (For a detailed account of these experiments see "The effect of aluminum sulphate on rhododendron seedlings," 1923, Bulletin 1, American Horticultural Society, 6 pages and 5 plates.)

These experiments will be extended during the coming season to larger rhododendron and other acid-soil plants in the deeper soil of outdoor plantings. For such situations, it is believed, amounts of aluminum sulphate up to half a pound per square yard may be applied advantageously and safely if the soil is of the ordinary fertile type, the application being repeated if the soil is not made acid by the first application.

Outdoor experiments with aluminum sulphate should not be tried in mixed plantings unless it is known that all the plants are suited to a strongly acid soil, because the ordinary plants of horticulture, which thrive best in a neutral or alkaline situation, are likely to be severely injured or killed by the aluminum sulphate.

For the present the aluminum-sulphate treatment should be regarded as experimental. Those desiring to try it on sickly rhododendrons should apply it to only a portion of a planting, always leaving another portion untreated for comparison.

Limestone water, which is alkaline in reaction, will ultimately injure an acid-soil planting. Rain water or some other water that is neutral or even acid in reaction should be used if practicable. If only alkaline water is available for sprinkling purposes, it can be made neutral or slightly acid by dissolving in it a suitable amount of aluminum sulphate. The proper amount can be determined by adding to a teaspoonful of the treated water in a white dish a fraction of a drop of the dye known as bromthymol blue. If the amount of aluminum sulphate added to the water was just sufficient to make it neutral, its color under this test will be green; if it has become acid, yellow; if it is still alkaline, blue. (For an account of the method of determining the degree of soil acidity see Edgar T. Wherry, 1922, "Soil acidity—its nature, measurement, and relation to plant distribution," Smithsonian Report for 1920, pages 247 to 268, with 1 plate and 1 color chart.)

Ornamental plants vary in the degree of soil acidity or alkalinity to which they are best adapted. The preparation of authentic lists of species on this basis will necessarily be a slow procedure, the outcome of careful experimentation, but fortunately a general though not infallible guide to the need of soil acidity for a particular species is already in existence in such well-known works on gardening as Nicholson's Illustrated Dictionary of Gardening and Bailey's Standard Encyclopedia of Horticulture. European gardeners have learned from long and cumulative experience that certain plants thrive best when

supplied with peat, and this knowledge has been handed down to us in garden literature and in garden practice when conducted intelligently, but never apparently with any suggestion that the essential quality of the peat was its acidity. The statement in any reliable work on gardening that a particular species requires peat may be taken as good evidence that this species is an acid-soil plant. In very many cases, however, especially in American works, even this evidence is lacking.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A year ago on the way to the north rim of the Grand Canyon, traveling through the Kaibab National Forest in a late afternoon, we were treated with the sight of some hundreds of wild deer that had come down into the open spaces or parks to graze. That is one of the great attractions to the public. Those who visit the national park seem to be more interested in the wild life than they are in the spectacles of inanimate nature. Dave Rust has provided a camp in V. T. or Demott Park, one of the open spaces in the Kaibab where people are accommodated over night who desire to watch the deer that come down in the open spaces and after many years of protection from the hunter have become so tame.

The Department of Agriculture has been agitating the question of the destruction of a large number of these deer in the Kaibab Forest, alleging that the number had become so great that there was not forage enough for them. Of course, nature has been taking care of a problem like that in the wilds for a good many centuries, but the department feels that it is necessary to permit men with guns to go in and kill off the surplus of those deer. There has been some question about the working out of the plan. I have a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, under the date of December 10, dealing with the situation which I shall ask to put in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, December 10, 1924.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMTON: The department is in receipt of your letter of November 29.

It is assumed from your question that you are familiar with the efforts which have been made in the last two months to remove from this area some 15,000 surplus deer. Several plans for accomplishing this have been worked out. For your information there is inclosed a copy of the special report to the department by the committee of experts who examined the area.

There have been several news dispatches from Flagstaff, Ariz., relative to the killing of the surplus deer on the Grand Canyon National Game Preserve. The first was to the effect that hunters were being allowed to kill not to exceed three head of deer each under a cooperative permit issued by authority of the late Secretary Wallace, who approved the plan prior to his death. This plan for removing surplus animals by hunting was put into effect only after we were satisfied that the first plan, namely, the giving away of the surplus deer, was a failure.

Despite the fact that a news item offering these deer free to any one who would pay the cost of crating and hauling to the railroad was published in almost every paper in the United States, we received orders for less than 300 deer, coming from about 50 separate individuals. About November 15 heavy snows over the Kaibab region made it impossible to continue the trapping and shipment of the animals, rendering it necessary to abandon that plan for the rest of the winter.

Under the Secretary's authority, the district forester at Ogden, Utah, was authorized to open the area to hunting, as stated. This went into effect early in November and continued for several days until stopped through the action of the sheriff of Coconino County, Ariz., who, under orders from the Governor of the State of Arizona, arrested three hunters from the neighboring State of Utah for having in their possession deer meat in violation of State law. This, of course, put an end to the issuance of further permits, as hunters naturally would not apply for permit with a prospect of being arrested. During the few days hunting was carried on approximately 388 deer were killed by 151 hunters. None of the deer were fat or even in fair condition. A five-point buck, called the "monarch of the herd," weighed, dressed, 153 pounds, showing the state of flesh of most of these animals.

In the meantime on application from the State game warden a permit was issued to the Governor of Arizona by the Secretary of Agriculture, early in November, for driving a large number of the deer ranging on the east side of the Kaibab Mountain but north of the canyon across the canyon and out on the south side. It should be understood that this drive necessitates the rounding up and driving of the deer—the contract calling for not more than 5,000 head—down a steep side canyon several miles in length, along and down one of the lower branches of the canyon for about 10 miles, swimming the river, and then climbing out over a 10 to 12 mile trail to the plateau on the south side of the canyon. The department has been doubtful whether

this plan is a practicable one, feeling that with the deer in a half-starved condition the drive would be very hard on them and would result in many losses through exhaustion, drowning, etc. It would also leave those that might reach the south plateau in poor condition to take care of themselves in a strange range during the coming winter. The plan was approved, however, in the hope that it would be more successful than we anticipated, and also to a certain extent being a direct but rather drastic means of reducing the surplus numbers in the herd.

Owing to complications in financing this drive, it has not yet been put in operation, although the permit was issued by wire on November 3.

In order to expedite matters and clear up several rather complicated situations the district forester in charge of this rather intricate problem of the distribution of the surplus deer proceeded to Phoenix, where he met in conferences Governor Hunt and the State game warden of Arizona. The result of these discussions was that the governor receded apparently from his position in arresting the Utah hunters for violation of State game laws and approved the continuation of hunting under the cooperative permit plan during a season from December 1 to January 5. This decision was also announced in Associated Press dispatches within the last few days and may be the one to which you refer.

We have not as yet received full information as to the result of the district forester's conferences with the Governor of Arizona. Apparently an understanding has been reached with the State authorities which will allow the department to continue to carry out its plans for reducing this herd of deer as rapidly as is possible. We are sincerely hoping the proposed drive will be carried out successfully. Everything which the department can do has been done and will continue to be done to assist the governor and the men in charge of the drive in putting it through.

I may say further that under this cooperative plan of hunting each cooperator contributes on the basis of \$5 for each deer killed, with a maximum of three deer to each hunter. One-fourth of the amount goes to the State and three-fourths to the Federal Government to cover the cost of supervising the hunting, the State not being put to any expense whatever in handling this matter.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. MARVIN,  
Acting Secretary.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have also the following letter from the department, giving data as to cattle grazing in the Kaibab:

(Fish and game, deer herd, cattle grazing)

KAIBAB, November 14, 1924.

Hon. LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMTON: The department has received your letter of November 7.

I am very glad indeed to furnish you the following information regarding the grazing of livestock on the Kaibab National Forest in Arizona, together with the receipts from grazing fees for the five-year period 1919 to 1923, inclusive. The table given here shows the grazing receipts for the period covered:

Year	Cattle and horses	Sheep and goats	Total
1919	\$7,525.32	\$659.37	\$8,184.69
1920	7,561.64	524.53	8,086.17
1921	7,054.67	647.68	7,702.35
1922	3,228.97	214.24	3,443.21
1923	5,375.31	467.40	5,842.71
Total	30,745.91	2,503.22	33,249.13

The following tabulation shows the number of stock grazed from and including the year 1912 to 1923, and also the estimated number of deer using the range with the livestock:

Year	Cattle and horses	Sheep and goats	Deer
1912	14,000	5,000	9,000
1913	13,000	5,000	12,000
1914	13,589	5,000	(1)
1915	15,303	5,000	(1)
1916	8,947	5,000	10,000
1917	8,354	5,000	15,000
1918	9,669	5,000	15,000
1919	9,209	5,000	15,000
1920	8,350	5,000	15,000
1921	7,404	4,375	20,000
1922	7,068	2,664	20,000
1923	5,685	3,660	25,000

<sup>1</sup> No estimate.



For the grazing season of 1924, just closed, the number of stock grazed was 3,339 cattle and 3,508 head of sheep, of which 1,000 were grazed for a short period due to drought emergency. These figures cover the stock grazed by a number of near-by settlers who are absolutely dependent upon the range within the Kaibab National Forest for grazing the stock on which they depend for a livelihood. There has never been but one large company operating on the Kaibab Forest, namely, the Grand Canyon Cattle Co., a California corporation, which purchased prior rights from old established settlers who used the range many years ago before either the game preserve or the national forest was created.

When the question of competition between the deer and the livestock became acute, reductions in the numbers grazed by the Grand Canyon Cattle Co. were at once begun, until from about 15,000, which they were grazing in 1906, they have been wholly eliminated from the forest. The company has not grazed any livestock on the forest during the season of 1924, and hereafter they will not be permittees. The rest of the permittees number approximately 67 individuals. Many of them graze not more than 20 head of cattle and several as low as 10 or 12 head. Only four of their number are grazing more than 200 head.

In considering the advisability of still further reducing the number of livestock using this forest the special committee of experts who recently investigated the conditions on the Kaibab reported that the stock now being grazed there are the property of numerous small stockmen wholly dependent upon this range for the support of themselves and families and the development of their farms and that "we have not the heart to recommend that the small cattle owner be entirely eliminated." It was the unanimous opinion of the committee in discussing the question of cattle grazing on this game preserve that while there was some competition between the two classes of animals, nevertheless, a total elimination of the cattle would not be more than a temporary relief, as the rapid increase of the deer herd would soon take up the slack gained by eliminating the cattle. The committee felt that the number of deer which this herd should properly contain should be about 15,000 head, which, if handled along proper lines of game management, could be grazed on the area with safety and at the same time take care of the stock belonging to these small settlers numbering approximately 3,000 head.

Very sincerely yours,

HOWARD M. GORE,  
Acting Secretary.

There is just as much sport in killing one of these deer, after so many years of protection of game in the Kaibab—just as much sport about it as there would be to go into a barnyard and kill a cow.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Is it not a fact that in that forest there has been an unusually heavy drought and the attitude of the department is that it would be better to permit some deer to be used as food than to have them die of starvation?

Mr. CRAMTON. The attitude of the department is not based on any unusual occasion in the past year, for the reason that I visited the locality in June, 1923, before these conditions came into being that the gentleman mentions, and the matter was then being agitated. It is not based on unusual conditions but it is based on their claim that there is not enough food for them. I say there is no sport in killing these deer. They have, however, in their regulations limited it and surrounded it with conditions as they would surround sport. They limit each hunter to the killing of three deer. If it is sport it should be so limited. But if the hunter is performing a public service or a service to the deer in killing the deer there is no reason for limiting each of them to three. Why let every Tom, Dick, and Harry loose at these deer, frightening all, while a few hundred are killed? In authorizing this they came into conflict with the State of Arizona, which had at first refused to permit the slaughter and threatened to enforce the State law, which would result in the arrest of the hunters. That seems to have been adjusted, as the concluding paragraph of the letter of the department states. They charge each hunter a fee of \$5 for each deer that is killed; that is, with a maximum of three deer he is charged \$15.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. I ask for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. I was wondering whether on the visit that the gentleman made in June he had any venison on the table?

Mr. CRAMTON. I did not. At that time they were not being killed, and I hoped then, and I hope yet, in some way there can be some arrangement by which they will not be

killed. The concluding paragraph of the letter sets forth that there has been an agreement arrived at between the department and the State of Arizona by which three-fourths of the \$5 goes to the United States and one-fourth to the State of Arizona. I do not know whether it is because the State of Arizona is to get a dollar and a quarter on each deer killed that has caused it to withdraw its opposition, but it appeals to me as a paltry financial mess. I do not know of anything that we can do to-day, but I hope the department will yet find a way to save this slaughter of 15,000 wild animals in a game preserve through so-called sportsmen. I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter from the department and some comment with reference to the situation by Mr. Mather, the director of the National Park Service, President Ivens, and others.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. These gentlemen emphasize what a shame it will be to again drive these deer away from contact with man, as will result if they are hunted and find that the open spaces where they have so many years been safe have again become to them places of danger.

#### ARE KAIBAB DEER DOOMED?

In a recent issue of Outdoor America Stephen T. Mather, Director of the National Park Service, gave the following survey of the situation in the Kaibab, which he has frequently visited:

Fifteen thousand mule deer in the Grand Canyon National Game Preserve of northern Arizona must be removed or destroyed without delay if recommendations made by a committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the conditions affecting the Kaibab deer herd are carried out. No more drastic measure in the history of game conservation in America than this has ever been proposed.

The Grand Canyon National Game Preserve was established by President Theodore Roosevelt November 28, 1906, under an act of Congress approved June 29, 1906, for the protection of wild animals in the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve. This act authorized the President of the United States to set aside areas within the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve for the protection of game animals and to be recognized as a sanctuary and breeding place. For 18 years the deer on this preserve have been protected, although the region formerly was a great Indian hunting ground. When the preserve was first established the herd comprised about 3,000 deer which had survived the hunters and predatory animals owing to favorable geographical conditions. With the protection that the deer have had, not only from man but through the killing off of predatory animals within the preserve, the estimated number of deer in 1923 made by forest officers and experts of the Biological Survey placed the number at 20,000. It was also estimated that the fawn crop had then reached the birth rate of from 5,000 to 8,000 a year, of which about one-half might be assumed to survive.

Using the estimate of 1923 of 20,000, with the survival of the 1924 fawn crop, the number of mule deer now in the forest would number about 26,000. Local people place the number at not less than 50,000.

While the game preserve includes approximately 800,000 acres, it is maintained that because of lines of natural drift only a small part of the area is utilized by the deer, and that range conditions, due to overutilization, are so poor that the deer are actually facing starvation.

The increasing number of deer is not alone responsible for depleted range conditions. The entire area has for years been intensively grazed by livestock owned by cattle companies and local settlers, the latter being partly dependent upon this range for a livelihood in that industry.

While some effort has been made to adjust competition between cattle, horses, and sheep and the increasing wild life, reductions in the number of livestock permitted to graze having been made from time to time, the range has been poorly managed. While it is maintained that cattle and horses are not competitors of the deer for forage, as the deer feed largely on browse in preference to grass, the grass within the so-called drift limits has been so badly overgrazed that it is a question whether the cattle and horses, in addition to the sheep, have not long been serious competitors with the deer for their natural forage and vice versa. Since settlement of the West began there has been constant conflict between domestic livestock and wild life for existence and wild life has steadily lost. Fortunately a new attitude toward wild life has been developed by game conservationists and despite the drastic measures proposed by the Kaibab deer committee I am confident that they approached the problem with utmost sincerity and with the welfare of the deer paramount in their thoughts.

I am not, however, ready to agree that it is necessary to carry out their recommendations relating to the killing of large numbers of the deer. Another thing that should be mentioned in connection with handling of the Grand Canyon game preserve is man's mistake in de-

stroying nature's own means of balance. If the cougars or mountain lions had not been so systematically thinned out, they would have kept the increase of the deer down to a safe margin that the preserve could have carried, but the cougars were also destructive to the cattle and horses.

Referring again to the recommendations of the deer committee, it is stated that they are made solely for the purpose (1) of preserving the Kaibab deer herd for all time with the maximum number of deer that the area will support, and (2) of providing certain remedial measures in the existing emergency so that the range may recuperate. In view of the existing emergency, due to the severe overutilization of the range, it is recommended that stock should at once be removed from the forest, excepting the limited numbers belonging to local settlers, and the Grand Canyon Cattle Co., the largest users of the range, have been requested to remove the balance of their cattle at once and have agreed to do so under certain conditions. In view of the present situation the committee believes that no reduction of less than 50 per cent of the existing herd would be effective and recommends that one-half be removed as quickly as possible. This means a reduction of from 13,000 to 25,000 deer, depending upon the accuracy of estimates that have been made.

Three methods of reduction are suggested, and it is stated the committee is of one mind in the belief that "the proper and logical method to be followed in reducing the Kaibab deer herd is to ship the deer alive to other localities. By this means other areas where deer are not native or from which they have been exterminated may be restocked. In certain places in the Kaibab preserve it should be a comparatively easy matter to trap deer in considerable numbers. These could then be crated and shipped to other forests, preserves, parks, or private estates where conditions are suitable for their propagation and where proper care would be given them."

The second method of reduction is that the preserve be opened to hunting under careful regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, such hunting as may be necessary to be carried on along the lines of modern and approved principles of game management. It is recognized that to this there is one important practical difficulty in the administration and management of hunting—the price charged by the State of Arizona for a nonresident hunter's license. The fee is \$20 with a limit of one deer. There are few Arizonians north of the Grand Canyon, most of the people local to this section living across an imaginary line in Utah.

The third method, which is recommended only as a last resort, is for the Government officially to destroy as many of the deer as may be necessary. Here also many practical difficulties are admitted.

Regarding the first recommendation for the reduction of the deer, it is to my mind logical, sane, humane, and the one that should be completely tried out within reasonable limits of time and expense before any consideration is given to the opening of the preserve to hunting. The Kaibab Plateau is practically isolated by almost impassable natural barriers, although possible permanent lines of drift to the north and west are admitted. One is northeast across the desert valley between the Kaibab Plateau and the higher country of Utah to the north. In my four trips, the first in 1920, through this section of the country, I have talked with many of the local people regarding the possible drift of deer into the mountains of Utah, and have been informed by reliable persons that an increasing number of deer in Utah is reported. These have undoubtedly followed this route, although it was freely admitted that any considerable drift is largely prevented by hunters along the route. However, so far as I am advised, no attempt has been made that would encourage such a drift by educational work among the Utah people as to the advantages to be accrued in permitting this drift to freely take place.

Another route is westward toward the Mount Trumbull district. President Anthony W. Ivins, of the Mormon Church, has known this country for the past 50 or 60 years and has gained from his own personal observation information that deer from the Kaibab Plateau work into the surrounding district. It is reported, however, that this year forage conditions are extremely bad on and around Mount Trumbull, due to overutilization of range by domestic livestock. While the Kaibab deer situation has been studied for several years, no attempts have been made to induce drifts artificially from the Kaibab Plateau, and the only suggestions put forth in this connection have been that shooting would accomplish this. The local people are vitally interested in the deer, and yet, except superficially, the local people have not been consulted, although a few of the local people who appeared at the conference held by the committee at V. T. Park in August had some very intelligent thoughts on the subject which might well be given careful consideration. The local cattle industry is not a paying proposition, yet no effort has been made to have the local people undertake the capturing of the deer fawn for raising and shipment to other localities for propagating purposes. It is my belief that a profitable local industry could be built up in this connection with proper encouragement.

To my mind the greatest evil that would result in opening the preserve to hunting, no matter how strict the regulations placed into

effect, or from an unthinkable wholesale slaughter undertaken officially, would be the disturbance of the present tame condition of the deer herd that would wipe out the work of 18 years in protecting them.

I do not believe that proper realization is had of what a valuable asset this section has in this tame herd, which attracts a golden stream of tourist travel. Nowhere else in this country is it possible for tourists to see with so little effort the sight of wild game in such numbers, living peacefully in their native habitat. As a tourist attraction alone the Kaibab deer herd represents an asset to the States of Arizona and Utah that will result in hundreds of thousands of dollars annually being brought into this section, and to disturb their condition by hunting or slaughtering them would be nothing short of a crime. My view is shared by President Ivins, long familiar with this section, who writes:

"I held the exclusive right for the ranging of cattle in the Kaibab Forest for a number of years, and in 1895 sold these interests to other stockmen. During that period there was no protection for the deer, and while they existed in considerable numbers, the constant inroads made upon them by Indians and white hunters kept them in a state of terror, so that they were rarely seen and hard to approach. Since protection has been provided for them the deer have become gentle and have increased until there are a great number in the forest.

"One of the most interesting features of the trip to the north rim of the Grand Canyon is the great number of deer which are nearly always visible from the road. If the hunting of these deer were permitted, they would again become wild, would retire from the traveled road and be rarely seen by tourists who visit the forest. Because of these and for other reasons I sincerely hope that no step will be taken which will allow the killing of deer, at least in the forest. If it is to be allowed at all, it should only be upon the ranges adjacent to the mountains to which they naturally drift when the mountain itself becomes overcrowded."

These same views are held by many others who have known conditions before the preserve was created and who realize what a valuable asset these deer are now in their tame condition. So far as hunting itself would be concerned, there would be no more sportsmanship in killing these tame deer than there would be in approaching a herd of tame cattle and shooting them.

During the past several years immense strides forward have been made in opening southern Utah and northern Arizona to tourist travel. Only a few years ago this section was practically unknown, but since the creation of Zion National Park in southwestern Utah, Bryce Canyon National Monument in Utah, almost due north of the Kaibab, and the improvement of the road across the Kaibab forest to the north rim of the Grand Canyon National Park the attention of the traveling public has been directed there and already thousands of people annually are bringing new life and development into this country through the dollars they are leaving.

It now only requires a motor trip of five or six days to view all of these outstanding features, and with the improved road conditions which are steadily being accomplished it will be as comparatively easy to cover this section as it is now to tour Yellowstone National Park.

More than 140,000 people have toured Yellowstone Park this season in about a three months' period, and here the season will be longer. With the magnificent scenery and the picturesque wild life to attract tourists there will be an annual stream going through this country, 200,000 visitors who at the most conservative estimates will leave \$10,000,000. Disturbing the condition of the deer by killing them off would, it is believed, reduce the annual flow of tourist gold through lessened travel by \$2,000,000 or more. Even by the wildest calculations this loss could not be made up through the sale of hunting licenses or directly from hunters who would come in for no other purpose than to hunt. As a practical dollars-and-cents proposition, the killing of the deer should not be permitted.

If the deer herd ought to be reduced to help in bringing the range and forage conditions back to normal, let us not be stampeded, but give more time and thought to putting into effect corrective measures that do not sacrifice the deer utterly. A thorough and exhaustive study, extending over a period of a year if necessary, should be made into every factor of the problem and the actual number of deer should be determined. This should be definitely undertaken before the Kaibab deer are doomed.

Myron Hunt has emphasized the folly of indiscriminate hunting in the preserve when he said:

Their second suggestion is, as I understand it, that hunters be allowed to reduce the number of deer, and a third, that if this proves to be insufficient, the forest rangers be empowered to reduce the number of deer. It is these last two suggestions that I wish could be reversed. We all noticed many old and poorly conditioned deer. If the Forest Service were instructed to use rifles with silencers on them and to shoot particularly old bucks and to a large extent old does, part of the problem would be taken care of. The suggestion that they use silencers is the crux of the whole thing. Those of use who are interested in the Kaibab Forest as a game preserve and who have



enjoyed the tameness of the game, know what will happen once the hunters are allowed in the forest for a season, even though they are allowed in it for the purpose of saving the deer from starving.

My report from Washington, giving me a digest of the committee's statement, does not state what I assume the report itself will have stated, that the recommendation that hunters only be allowed on the perimeter of the mountain and that they be distributed in such a manner as to drive the deer to those portions of the mountain that they have for some unknown reason seemed least to frequent. If this is intelligently carried out, it is just possible that the deer will make of the center of the mountain a place of refuge and will at that point be comparatively tame as they are in the national parks, not more than a mile inside of the limits which they shortly come to understand as the limits beyond which hunters may not come.

The forest rangers spoke of their intention to use such methods, and if hunters are allowed in there, it is to be hoped that these methods will be carried out. I am sorry, and I think a large portion of the public will be sorry, to feel that there is not some method of reducing this herd that would not make the remaining deer so wild as to take away from them that tameness which is their present charm.

It will be noted the department makes no mention of any such safeguards as Mr. Hunt has suggested.

Gov. George W. P. Hunt, of Arizona, recently said:

I am very much opposed to the slaughter of these deer. There could be no sport in killing them, as they are almost as tame as cows in the field. I saw no evidence that the deer were in danger of starving, although I am advised that the lower plateau range is dangerously overstocked.

I have read the report in which the committee appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture has recommended the herd be reduced one-half, and I believe this to be unwarranted, as I do not think any such emergency exists.

It may be necessary to reduce the herd to some extent, and in doing so, I believe sufficient interest could be aroused among sportsmen to provide for the transporting of a part of the herd for restocking other areas.

The slaughter of these partially tamed animals should not be permitted.

A vigorous view has been that of the Phoenix Gazette in this editorial:

Sportsmen, real sportsmen, throughout the Nation will see red if the order is issued for the slaughter of half the Kaibab deer herd, as recommended in the preliminary report of the Forest Service committee to Secretary of Agriculture Wallace.

It is hard to conceive in this age that the Government would sanction the murdering of 15,000 deer, and murder is what it will amount to. The deer of Kaibab preserve have been the wards of the Government since 1906. There will be no sport involved in the killing of them, because they are as tame as calves. Hunters who will hunt the Kaibab deer will butcher them, will shoot them down with the lust of blood as their only incentive—shoot while the betrayed deer stand gazing at them with the great hazel eyes that have paralyzed the trigger finger of many a real sportsman.

The only excuse offered for the slaughter of the deer in Kaibab is the threatened destruction of the herd because of poor range conditions. The authorities are afraid to let nature take its course, or so they argue.

Nature is a grand old nurse to wild life. In the history of the great game herds of the West, man and not nature has destroyed them, just as man would now destroy the last remaining great deer herd of the Nation.

If nature is permitted to do its own thinning in the Kaibab forest, she will destroy the weaklings. If man slaughters, he will take only the strong and leave the weaklings to impoverish the future generations of this great herd.

Range conditions change yearly. There is every possibility this coming winter and spring will completely change the status of conditions in the Kaibab forest. Unless a deliberate and ruthless slaughter of the animals is engaged in man can not change the conditions sooner.

This is a matter of great importance in our program of game conservation and park development, and I believe should be worked out with more care and less haste than the letter from the department indicates now obtains.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I do not rise to-day to defend any policy of slaughtering wild animals needlessly, but I do say that this is a practical question. In that section of our country where the Kaibab is situated during the last few years, and particularly during the season just closed, there has been an unusual drought. The cattle grazing upon the ranges are in poor condition and some of the States have taken means of assisting the owners to get them through the winter. It will be impossible for much of this stock to graze upon the

public lands as they have in the past during the winter. I understand that the policy of the department is really one actuated by humane purposes, that a survey of the forage on the forest and immediate vicinities discloses that it can not graze or browse the number of wild deer now found there, and they are permitting certain hunters to go into these isolated sections for the purpose of killing a few of these deer, knowing full well that they will die if that is not done, and thereby saving a food supply to the people of that section of the country. It is simply a question of letting them die or killing them for food. I do not believe there is any attempt on the part of the department to spoil the pleasure of those who visit this forest. These few deer that are killed will not make the rest of them so wild in my opinion that they can not be seen. It is really a humane act. Unless something is done they will starve. Is it more humane to let them starve or shoot them?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman understand that the department has in mind the killing of some ten or fifteen thousand deer? I have not the figures at hand, but it is some such large number.

Mr. COLTON. I do not know the number it is intended to have killed. I did not understand that it was anything like so large a number; but the purpose is to reduce the number to a point where the forage of the forest will maintain them.

Mr. KINDRED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. KINDRED. The gentleman has spoken of the desirability of driving these animals back to the wilds and hunting and killing them for food purposes. Can they not be killed by humane means to save the forage without driving them back into the wilds and pursuing them?

Mr. COLTON. I think the gentleman is quite right. If there is a more humane way of killing than shooting, then use it. I would be in favor of a policy of that kind, but my understanding is that it is still a question of letting them die for lack of food or saving a part of them by reducing the number and using the number killed for food purposes. It will not necessarily drive them back to the wilds—they are already there.

Mr. KINDRED. Would it not be more economical to kill them humanely in their present state of tameness than to drive them back into the wilds and hunt them?

Mr. COLTON. That is correct, probably, if there is some practical way of doing it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I have here the report of the survey made at the request of the department. They say:

The committee believes that as an immediate remedy for the present situation no reduction of less than 50 per cent of the existing deer herd would be effective. We therefore recommend that one-half of the existing herd be removed, and that its removal be accomplished as speedily as possible.

And it has been estimated that there are something like 50,000 deer there. I am not accurate as to the amount, but it is something like that, so that somewhere between fifteen and twenty-five thousand deer are to be killed.

Mr. COLTON. I think the gentleman's estimate is too high. I do not believe there are 50,000 head of deer in the Kaibab Forest.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN] has just called my attention to the fact that deer are scarce in his State. He states they could pasture and feed a part of these deer. If the freight and express rates were not so high, these deer might be shipped to other States, where they could be cared for. I would like to see them taken to other States where the forage would sustain them; but if that can not be done, they ought not to be exterminated by starvation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the construction of sanitary facilities and for fire-preventive measures on public camp grounds within the national forests when necessary for the protection of the public health or the prevention of forest fires, \$25,000.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAGON: Page 36, line 7, after the word "fires" strike out "\$25,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000."



Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter in which I think every Representative here should be vitally interested. The improved road conditions of the national forests at this time have given rise to another condition, which provides one of the great perils of forestry in this country. I wish I could recall the exact figures that the Forestry Bureau gives us as the number of visitors that visited our national forests 6 or 8 or 10 years ago and the number that visit them to-day. Suffice it to say that in the year 1922 there were over 6,000,000 people who visited the national forests of the United States; and in 1924, the present year, I am advised by the forestry officials that over 10,000,000 people have gone through the 147 national forests in this country. That brings the condition about which I desire to speak. There are over 1,500 camping spots. This appropriation seeks to construct these camping spots so as to reduce the fire hazard, as well as to build up the recreational features of them. We have this great influx of annual visitors brought about through the improved highways that go through these forests, and we have not any place to take care of them. These tourists, hikers, campers, naturalists—a great many of them—go in there without any primary knowledge of good forestry, and as a result of their ignorance our forests are left to their mercy. These recreational features are worth a great deal to the forestry of this country. As the good roads have attracted millions of people to the national forests, the establishment of these recreational camps will naturally educate great numbers of tourists and health seekers in proper forest practice.

It is interesting to know that of the millions of dollars that have been given to the national parks, so far as I am advised an unremunerative enterprise to the Government, we have for the purpose of establishing recreational camp grounds in our national forests expended the puny sum in the last two years of \$25,000. The figures, as Mr. Greeley, chief forester, gives them, to put one of these camps in a proper condition with proper facilities and the proper requirements to make it the kind of camp ground we ought to have in these national forests, is based upon an estimate of 960 camps—I believe it was in the year 1922 from which they took the figures—and the estimate of these 960 camp grounds there were over 1,300,000 people who availed themselves of those camp grounds. The forestry people based an estimate of the requirements properly to handle these 1,360,000 people, that 2 cents per person could be expended in preparing these camps with proper facilities with reference to the starting of fires and sanitary conditions around the camps, and that as a result of this 2 cents of expenditure upon the people who went into these camp grounds in 1922 it would amount to \$122,000. In other words—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAGON. I ask unanimous consent to continue for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAGON. In other words, in these 960 camp grounds upon which the Forestry Bureau base their statistics, it requires \$122,000 in order properly to care for them. Now, it is perhaps a sad commentary upon our Government that these recreational camp grounds in the national forests of this country have been built up and sustained by civic organizations to a greater extent in the communities that surround our national forests. The Wichita Forest, in Oklahoma, which is one of the most attractive forests, has many recreational features built up and established by the industrious and enterprising people surrounding the forest. The same is true, if I am correctly advised, as to the Colorado recreational camp grounds. I say to you that the Government can not afford not to keep step with the enterprising civic organizations of the community that surround these national forests and for good reasons, so far as the Government is concerned. First, our national forests this year, if I am correctly advised—and I get the information from the Bureau of Forestry—our national forests brought in over \$5,300,000, and for administration and fire-prevention measures there was expended \$5,100,000. But the monetary value of our national forests is not the only thing. There is an educational value. As I pointed out in an address the other day the men of New England and the men of New York and the men of the Central States of this Union, are as much interested in the forests of Oregon and Washington and Arkansas and Louisiana as the people who live in those respective States. Why? Because every time you construct a frame building you take into consideration the forests of these Western and Southern States, and I say to you it behooves every man in the United States, with our lumber

supply rapidly diminishing and the price of lumber rapidly rising—it behooves everyone to take a particular interest in our forests, and we can not do anything better than to teach from your recreational camp grounds everyone of these men, women, and children who come into those grounds what a disastrous result can occur by leaving a smouldering fire in the camp grounds, and educate them in the primary principles of good forestry. The recreational value of our forests is great in the precaution which goes in the introduction of proper forest methods to the people who live outside the forests where the greatest amount of our timber products really is. Then it has another value.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] here has just called the attention of the House to the condition which exists, I believe, in Arizona. I want to say to you I believe the Arkansas forests, which are the largest in the South or East, could take care of every surplus deer we have in the State of Arizona. If I am properly informed, however, we can not handle them in the East and South because they are not properly acclimated.

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will yield, we think that could properly be handled if freight and express rates were not so high to bring them back.

Mr. RAGON. That is just one of the purposes I have in mind in introducing this amendment. If these deer can be raised and kept and maintained in the climates of Arkansas and Pisgah forests, North Carolina—if they are to be destroyed out there—why not let them go there or to the Ozarks forest, where we have not now 40 deer?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. I am not opposed to recreation. Everybody knows the benefits that can be derived from proper recreation. But the Government is not in a position where it can create a recreational park system. This appropriation is not for such a purpose. I assume that this appropriation is more for the purpose of having some person representing the Government look generally after these forest camp grounds. The first appropriation was made in 1923, \$10,000. Then it was increased in 1924 to \$15,000, and last year we increased that amount to \$25,000.

The purpose of this appropriation, as I understand, is not, generally speaking, to prevent forest fires. There are other appropriations for that purpose carried in the bill. On page 35 is an appropriation of \$283,000. Further on in the bill, on page 70, we have a further appropriation under miscellaneous items of \$660,000.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there for a question?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Let me make my statement first. The gentleman had the floor and was not interrupted. When I get through I will be glad to yield. The gentleman states that at one of these parks there were a million visitors, and he estimates that at the rate of 2 cents each, or \$20,000, they probably could lay out a recreational park. With such sum, perhaps, they could provide an athletic field, a gymnasium, tennis courts, baseball and football grounds, and perhaps a complete system of sewerage. I do not know about that. It would all be extremely idealistic. There is no question about that. But up to date we have about 1,500 camp grounds in our national forests, and they are increasing all the while. If you take the case of the gentleman's camp ground as an illustration, and, of course, if you are going to provide these idealistic recreational features in one park, you would eventually have to provide them in all the others, instead of this service costing \$15,000 or \$20,000 per year it would cost annually \$30,000,000.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. RAGON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. RAGON. In this particular item the money is not for the prevention of forest fires generally, but in specific camp grounds. I have not any idea of one penny going into my State. I am interested in the matter in a general way.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman would not advocate what he contemplates in one park and then deny it in another park?

Mr. RAGON. Oh, no.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Then I will ask the gentleman if he is in favor of starting out on a program that will ultimately entail an annual expenditure of \$30,000,000?

Mr. RAGON. No; it would not take that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CRAMTON. The particular amendment is only for \$20,000. I hope no one is misled by that innocent amount. The program of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. RAGON] seems to me to be based upon an erroneous conception of the relative fields of the national parks and the national forests. When he first presented this amendment to the House last Tuesday he said:

Notwithstanding the Government spent millions of dollars last year and will continue to spend for the proper maintenance of our national parks, which have only an educational value, with an incidental recreational value, yet we spent the small sum of \$15,000 for development of the recreational features of our national forests, which not only carry with them an educational, recreational, and a health value but also carry a monetary value to our Government.

It needs to be emphasized that the national forest system is primarily for the preservation of the forests and the forestry experiments, and not to provide recreation. Any recreation provided in our national forests is absolutely incidental, and we should not engage in a different program from that. There are many places where towns have contributed money to maintain what is practically a municipal park in a national forest. It is very proper that they should contribute money under those conditions. But when it comes to considering them—the great park system in this country—not only for education but for recreation, that is a different proposition. Of the thousands and thousands that now go into our national parks the great annual increase is from those who go in automobiles. They camp; they patronize the camps in those parks. It is a matter of recreation and health to them. That is not incidental; it is one of the main purposes of national parks.

I hope that whatever national parks we have in this country will be maintained as one park system, will be kept in one bureau and not scattered in half a dozen competing bureaus.

I am not going to argue the particular amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas in so far as it is incidental to the main idea of forestry, but I do dissent from the idea that these forests as the field of recreation do a greater and more valuable work than the national parks. He is putting the cart before the horse. I hope, therefore, the amendment will not pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of tree seed, cones, and nursery stock, for seeding and tree planting within national forests, and for experiments and investigations necessary for such seeding and tree planting, \$131,705: *Provided*, That from the nurseries on the Nebraska National Forest the Secretary of Agriculture, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish young trees free, so far as they may be spared, to residents of the territory covered by "An act increasing the area of homesteads in a portion of Nebraska," approved April 28, 1904: *Provided further*, That additional land may be purchased at a total cost of not to exceed \$900 adjacent to the present Beal Nursery, in East Tawas, Mich.;

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting cereal and forage crops, including a special investigation of the Hessian fly, grasshopper, alfalfa weevil, and the chinch bug, \$197,700;

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 45, line 15, after the word "bug," strike out "\$197,700" and insert "\$397,700."

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I understand a number of gentlemen on this side would like to discuss this amendment. I wonder if I can get an agreement with the chairman for 15 minutes to a side, 30 minutes on this amendment?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. What is the special purpose of the appropriation? Has it any particular purpose?

Mr. HUDSPETH. We ask for an appropriation so that we may destroy the grasshoppers that have been infesting the Southwest for a number of years.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to do what is fair and I will accept the proposition made by the gentleman from Texas of 15 minutes on a side.

Mr. HUDSPETH. That is reasonable. Mr. Chairman, I want to consume but five minutes—

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Just a moment, please. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I want five minutes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] give it to you?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; I will give the gentleman from Texas five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] is to control the time and will give me five minutes that will be all right.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Several gentlemen have asked for time on this side, because this is in the interest of the farmer.

Mr. BLANTON. This is a very important item in the bill and we ought to have some time on it.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman from Texas says he will give you five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House: I trust that the farmer Representative from Kansas [Mr. TINCHESTER] will not leave because, gentlemen, this is an amendment in the interest of the farmer, and those who are the friends of the farmer ought to vote for this amendment.

For the past several years, and especially last year, it has been estimated by the Agricultural Department that the grasshopper, which infested Texas very largely, destroyed 1,000,000 bales of cotton. I want to state to my friend from New York [Mr. MAGEE], who does not live in a cotton section, that he can estimate how much revenue was taken by this pest which infested the great Southwest. Why, gentlemen, in Kansas, in Texas, and I understand in Oklahoma, the grasshopper swooped down and did not leave even a leaf upon a tree and not a vestige of vegetation upon the ground; they not only destroyed crops throughout the West, but they destroyed the grass, and in many places the ranges were absolutely denuded of grass.

I have read the hearings with regard to the various subjects about which the committee held exhaustive hearings, and right here I want to state to my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], who is a farmer and who is the ranking Democrat on this side, that the bill carries \$368,000 for eradicating the corn borer. I take it you gentlemen throughout the Northwest, around Lake Erie and Lake Huron, are interested in the eradication of the corn borer, yet you give the measly sum of \$197,000 for the eradication of the grasshopper and other insects, and I do not find a single line in the hearings—and I am not criticizing the committee—relative to the destruction by the grasshopper. Every man in Texas and throughout the Southwest is familiar with the devastation of the grasshopper and how he has denuded the ranges and crops. Why, he will take every leaf off the corn, every leaf off a stalk of cotton, and leave the ground as bare as this floor. Yet I do not find, gentlemen, in these hearings where there was any information sought as to how this pest could be eradicated. It is not a new proposition; it has been going on for years, but last year it was more destructive than in any previous year, as far as my information goes. And I would like for my farmer friends from Oklahoma to give me their attention, because they are interested in this thing. I am talking for the farmer, and I want those who represent him to give heed, because he is interested.

We are only asking that a sufficient sum be allowed in this bill to eradicate the grasshopper. Every man who is familiar with the destruction of this pest knows how it swoops down from the north, across the plains of Kansas and Oklahoma, and destroys everything in its wake. If you will give the matter any consideration at all, I think you will appreciate the importance of raising this sum only \$200,000, so we can eradicate the grasshopper, and with sufficient funds it can be eradicated.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. President Coolidge tells us the trouble with the farmer now is that he is overproduced already. Does not the gentleman think that if that contention is true, it would be a good thing to save this appropriation and let the grasshoppers eat up what the farmer has?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Does the gentleman think that with cotton selling at 30 cents a pound and alfalfa hay selling at \$37 a ton throughout the West that the farmer is overproduced?

Mr. ROMJUE. No; I disagree with that.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The old ranchmen out there would take serious issue with that statement when they are compelled to pay \$62 a ton for cottonseed cake to feed their cattle, because the grasshopper destroyed their grass in many instances.

Mr. ROMJUE. I totally disagree with the President.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I disagree with the President on that, although I agree with him on some things, but not on that.

Mr. ROMJUE. If that contention is true I think the farmer would be better off if we saved this appropriation and let the grasshopper eat up what he has.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I do not think the farmer is overproduced, and I do not think, when we get from 25 to 30 cents a pound for cotton, we are overproduced. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, this amendment is in the interest of the farmer and stock raiser and it ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, usually I back up the committee and the Budget in their estimates of expenses. It is rarely the case that I ever vote for an item of increase over the Budget. But the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] vitally affects a great portion of the State of Kansas, a great portion of the State of Oklahoma, a great portion of the States of Colorado and Arizona, as well as a great portion of the State of Texas.

I went through a part of the district of my colleague [Mr. JONES] this summer and saw orchards, 10 and 15 years old, with the bark stripped off of the trees by grasshoppers and the trees dead. I saw in his district crops of corn that were absolutely stripped to the stalk, not a vestige of anything left except the mere stalk, where it meant everything to the farmer and his family. I want to say it affects thousands and thousands of farmers through the destruction of their crops, which means the yearly income of the whole family. That being the case, I take it this amendment will meet with the serious consideration of this committee.

It is a menace which affects the production of the whole country. My colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] told you it meant the loss of \$1,000,000 of cotton in Texas; if it means that loss, it means a loss of wearing apparel to greater extent for the people of the country; it means an increase in the cost of production which must be borne by the consumers of the country; and in food products alone, I dare say, it means a loss of millions of dollars to the United States Government and its people each year.

Why should not this amendment be adopted? What part of the \$70,000,000 we have been spending annually in the name of agriculture is more important than this particular subject which deals with the entire year's income of whole families, thousands of them, scattered throughout many States?

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. What success have they met with in fighting these insects?

Mr. BLANTON. Very little within the practical reach of ordinary farmers. They have been spending, as I say, from \$50,000,000 to \$70,000,000 each year in the name of agriculture, and yet these expert scientists in this Bureau of Entomology have not yet discovered a means whereby the problem may be met successfully by the ordinary farmer.

The farmer plants his crop, he borrows the money to get his feed, he borrows the money to get his seed, and then he plants a crop. He is under contract in many instances to pay a large rental. His whole family helps him to prepare his land and to plant it. The crop comes up and he cultivates it. It gives promise of great production, and when the harvest is almost ready to begin the grasshoppers swoop down on him and leave him not a thing for his whole year's work. It is entirely too expensive for him to poison them. They come out of adjoining pastures in swarms. It is too late to cope with them then, for the proper solution is to find means to prevent them from being hatched out.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly.

Mr. REED of New York. Then this is for the purpose of studying the proposition to see if they can find some way of eradicating these insects?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; and for no other purpose. Not a dollar will be spent except in research work.

Mr. REED of New York. Have they met with any success so far?

Mr. BLANTON. Very little, substantially, for poisoning is too expensive. The people all over these States I have mentioned—Kansas, Oklahoma, Arizona, Colorado, Texas, and

other places—will write to the Secretary of Agriculture and say, "For God's sake, send us some relief," and he will answer them and say they have not the money and that Congress will not furnish it to them. This amendment will keep them from passing the buck.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if the \$100,000, by which amount they seek to increase this item, would do any good, there might be some grounds for advocating it; but the grasshopper problem is 50 years or more old. They have given it strict attention in the Department of Agriculture, year after year, with a yearly sum for research work to find remedies for the situation brought about by these grasshoppers. They have found a remedy and it has proven successful. My friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] said he had looked all through the hearings and had found nothing in them about the grasshopper. There is no use repeating in each annual hearing problems that have been solved and problems that have been settled. Had the gentleman gone back one year or two years he would have found the grasshopper situation discussed. He would have found the remedy set out. He would have found where the department officials had taught them how to successfully apply the remedy.

Therefore this appropriation will do no good. We still carry an allotment of \$24,000 for research work to study this problem.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. The solution to which the gentleman refers is rather expensive when it is applied, is it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. JONES. I know that when they undertook to kill the grasshoppers in the quantities found out in certain sections of the Southwest this year it was rather expensive to follow the method which the department set out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let me read from the hearings of last year:

The method of control is using poison bran mash. This poison bran mash is prepared with white arsenic.

This is sown—it depending upon what particular district—at certain times in the day. In some districts it may be sown early in the morning, or perhaps not until 10 or 11 o'clock, while in other places it may be in the afternoon or evening. These are problems that have to be worked out by research, because the proper time for the distribution of this poison may vary in different localities.

The proper time depends upon when the grasshopper gets warm. In the morning, as soon as he gets warm, he commences to feed, and when he commences to feed is the proper time to distribute the bran mash.

Bran mash is not very expensive, and neither is white arsenic.

Mr. JONES. According to the hearings, though, the problem must be worked out further and the solution is not complete. According to the statement you have just given us, he says these are problems that have to be worked out by research. As I understand it, the solution they have already obtained is a very expensive one, and one that is not known as fully as it might be, and has not been worked out in perhaps as economical a way as it could be if they devoted more attention to it. I am not as familiar with it as I might be, but that is my understanding.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The department states in this hearing, "the cost would run from 25 to 30 cents an acre." Is that expensive? Of course, it would vary according as the price of bran mash might be a little higher or a little lower, or the price of white arsenic might be a little higher or a little lower, but I contend that 25 or 30 cents an acre to kill grasshoppers is a cheap remedy, and as cheap as any they will ever find.

Mr. JONES. The trouble is, that is the cost of one application, and one application will not do the work. It has to be applied from time to time. If one application would do the work that would be an inexpensive method, but as I understand it, the remedy which they suggest has to be applied time after time.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Do I understand my colleague to say that the Department of Agriculture has found that in the application of arsenic on a fiber plant such as cotton, it can be applied for 30 cents an acre?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will say to my colleague from Texas that this is poisoned bran and you scatter the bran where the grasshoppers are at about the time they feed, and they eat the bran and die from it.



Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I do not know so much about that proposition, but my colleague will realize that we have had some pretty expensive experiments down in Texas in the application of white arsenic to kill the pink boll worm and the boll weevil.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is calcium arsenate. I think the gentleman is mistaken about the remedy.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the committee will notice that this appropriation is only for making investigations for the purpose of finding causes and, if possible, remedies. That is why it is limited in amount. If it was for the purpose of applying a remedy, for doing the physical work and paying the expense of it, the amount would have to be very much larger. Gentlemen who ask for a large increase of this item evidently believe that if the appropriation were increased as they wish the Secretary of Agriculture would organize and carry on a campaign of extermination, and pay all the cost of it, to be waged against grasshoppers and similar plagues. No; the money in this item is altogether for investigation to find preventive or corrective methods of relieving the farms of grasshoppers. The fact is that each year for many years there has been an appropriation for this and similar work, and the Department of Agriculture, through its investigational force, has worked out remedies. The trouble is that some of the people for whose benefit they have been worked out refuse to apply them and wish money from the Federal Treasury for the employment of experts, laborers, and machines to go out and do the physical work necessary to apply those remedies.

In my judgment that is not a part of the duty of the Agricultural Department. It is not a duty which the Federal Government ought to perform. Investigational work ought to be pursued, and the Congress ought to furnish abundant money to enable the department to discover or work out remedies; but when remedies are found and their application requires only physical labor and effort, they ought to be applied by those for whose benefit the work is to be done.

Now, as was clearly and ably stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], a remedy has been worked out as far as possible by the department. It is well known and those whose crops are attacked or threatened should apply it. They should at least try to protect their own property.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. COLTON. Is it a fact that where the remedy has been applied it has been effective?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I believe it has been quite successful; very helpful, at least.

Mr. COLTON. I will say that in my own district we had a large number of crickets that invaded a part of my State. The people applied this same remedy that was recommended by the department which it had worked out, and it has been very effective in the last year or two.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I favor economy and, as a rule, am inclined to decrease rather than increase appropriation bills passed by the House. I am constrained, however, to favor the amendment offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH]. His district is about 700 miles from the one I represent, and yet the pest of grasshoppers mentioned by him and also spoken of by my other colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] penetrated my district during the present year.

This past summer, in company with my predecessor, Judge Rufus Hardy, I made a trip from Navarro County to Freestone County, and we witnessed the ravages of the grasshopper. On a number of farms it appeared as though an invading army had marched across the fields of cotton and corn and left them bare as the floor.

This is the first year that the grasshopper has been of any serious consequence in my section of the State, and it indicates that the pest, instead of being checked, is on the increase. The opponents of this amendment claim that the Government has already solved the problem of discovering a remedy, but if such has been discovered it must not be in a perfected state. If so, why does this bill make any appropriation whatever for the purpose of investigating means to destroy the grasshopper and other insects therein mentioned. This bill seems exceedingly generous in discovering means to eliminate other pests not known in the great Southwest. The sum of \$280,000 is provided for the investigation and prevention of the spread of the Japanese beetle; \$383,630 to prevent the spread of the corn borer; and \$740,000 to prevent the spread of moths. The increase in the appropriation proposed by my colleague's amendment is infinitesimally small when compared with the value of the crops sought to be protected. The sixth congressional district, which I have the honor to represent, produced in 1923 over 400,000 bales of cotton, and

the increase in the appropriation proposed by my colleague [Mr. HUDSPETH] represents less than one-half of 1 per cent of the value of the cotton crop in that district alone.

The destruction wrought by the grasshopper in one county in my district during the present year is many times larger than the entire sum of money involved in this amendment. I trust it will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman, I regard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] as highly as any man on the floor. This is not a new question. The bill carries an appropriation of \$24,000 for research work to find a way to get rid of the grasshopper. To add to that appropriation money to conduct further research work would not in any way help the American farmer. The department has all the money it wants for that use. They have been investigating a way to get rid of the grasshopper for a good many years. They have a remedy. There is a plan you can use that will prevent the grasshopper from taking the crop.

The old question comes back. Will the Government administer the remedy or will it confine its activity to research work and finding the remedy? If we are going to administer the remedy, we would need two or three million dollars, because \$200,000 would not be a drop in the bucket.

In Kansas, where the grasshopper has been prevalent this year, our people have been spending from their own fund for years in fighting the pest. If the Government is going to make a fight in one locality, it should make the fight in other localities. I want to vote for everything for the farmer, but I do not want to be put in the foolish attitude of voting a lot of money for the department to conduct its investigation when I know that the department will not use it. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the question has been already solved successfully, why appropriate this amount that is included in the bill for the investigation of insects doing this damage?

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, no one claims that the last word on the question has been said. It is absolutely all right to continue the investigation, and I am not saying that I would not, if there is a real emergency, vote for an appropriation for the Government to make the fight; but that is the question. Men talk on this amendment as though, if you would increase the appropriation by \$200,000, Uncle Reuben, as you call him, could expect that that \$200,000 would be used in wiping out the grasshoppers in his fields, and nothing could be more deceptive to the American farmer than to pass an amendment with that representation.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. If, as my colleague from Texas has stated, you have an effective remedy now, why is the grasshopper increasing by millions each year and extending over a vast territory last year which it had not touched before?

Mr. TINCHER. All I say about the effective remedy is that we have an effective remedy whereby, if you spend enough money, you can eradicate the grasshopper from your fields. Such an occurrence as has been described—grasshoppers coming in in swarms—we have not had in Kansas since 1873. I did not know that they were visiting Texas in that way. However, I am not in favor of abolishing the research work and if \$24,000 is not enough I would vote to increase it. But, as a friend of the American farmer, I do not want to be put in the attitude of voting to increase this \$200,000 upon the theory that the money will be used to eradicate grasshoppers. I was on this committee for years, when we had hearings. It is an old question with some of us. You vote to appropriate money for research work, and they use so much as they want of it, and I understand that they have asked for only \$24,000, and that is perhaps all that they can successfully spend in conducting this investigation, and it will perhaps pay all of the men qualified to make the investigation that are now in the department.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman ought to know that every grasshopper that is in Texas now has a Kansas brand upon it. They all came from Kansas.

Mr. TINCHER. I am thankful for the fact that Kansas did not furnish Texas all her pests. There are other sorts of pests in Texas that did not come from Kansas. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUDSPETH) there were—ayes 34, noes 48.  
So the amendment was rejected.  
The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations of insects affecting southern field crops, including insects affecting cotton, tobacco, rice, sugar cane, etc., and the cigarette beetle and Argentine ant, \$255,440.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. For the benefit of those here who represent the cotton districts I rise to state that this is an increase in this appropriation of \$15,000; \$7,500 is for the eradication of the cotton flea and the other \$7,500 of this increase is to investigate what is known as the Arizona boll weevil. It is a new pest or a new species of boll weevil, although it belongs to the same family. This pest has fed for years upon the wild cotton that grows in the mountains of Arizona. It prospers and flourishes and multiplies in dry weather. That is where the danger lies. If it should gain entrance into the plains of Texas and other States where the old boll weevil does not affect the cotton on the high and dry lands, it would be very disastrous. If this pest should get an entrance into Texas from Tucson, Ariz., and then into Oklahoma and on over the Cotton Belt, you would have the old boll weevil that destroys the cotton in a wet year and you would have also a weevil that flourishes and destroys the cotton in a dry year. It is important to the people of the Cotton Belt that we take every step, quarantine and otherwise, to prevent the immigration of this dry-weather weevil into the Cotton Belt of Texas, Oklahoma, or any other States. Of course, it can not be handled. It seems as though this bug has even challenged the science and knowledge and ingenuity and intellect of man. I have always had an abiding faith that man's intellect could control any insect that ever existed upon the earth, but I am about convinced that even with the best scientific men in the world in our Bureau of Entomology that that one little insect is their superior and that it survives in spite of their ingenuity and poison.

I want at this point to read a little doggerel:

#### TWO KINDS OF BOLL WEEVILS

Boll weevils are two kinds  
That live on cotton bolls;  
Each feasts on what he finds—  
Whether dry, wet, or cold.

The new bug is a hummer;  
A kind of bug that's dry,  
He lives his best in summer  
When rain has passed him by.

That old boll-weevil bug  
Feasts when the showers fall,  
But when its dry the plug  
Will never make a call.

Just as the weather man  
Directs the sun and rain,  
These bugs stick to a plan  
And watch the weather vane.

Like old Jack Sprat and wife,  
Who licked the platter clean,  
These bugs sustain bug life—  
The farmer's left between.

And thus the farmer's way  
Toward the river Styx  
Is pestered every day—  
He's in "one hell of a fix."

Insects new and insects old;  
Insects shrewd and insects bold;  
Insects wet and insects dry;  
Insects tame and insects shy;  
Insects rough and insects tough—  
God knows we've had insects enough.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of the Montana national bison range and other reservations and for the maintenance of game introduced into suitable localities on public lands, under supervision of the Biological Survey, including construction of fencing, wardens' quarters, shelters for animals, landings, roads, trails, bridges, ditches, telephone lines, rockwork, bulkheads, and other improvements necessary for the economical administration and protection of the reservations, and for the enforcement of section 84 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled

"An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," \$46,215: *Provided*, That \$2,500 may be used for the purchase, capture, and transportation of game for national reservations.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ANDERSON: Page 50, line 11, after the words "United States," strike out the figures "\$46,215" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$58,215"; and at the end of the section, line 13, add the following: "*Provided further*, That \$12,000 may be used for the construction of a highway through Sullys Hill National Park, and in the construction thereof the Chief of the Bureau of Biological Survey may cooperate with the Bureau of Public Roads."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to provide for the construction of a road through Sullys Hill National Park. The State of North Dakota, in cooperation with the Federal Government, has provided for the construction of a road between two county seats, Devils Lake and Minnewaukan. As this road is laid out it runs through the Sullys Hill National Park. The Federal Government could now provide \$6,000, or one-half of the sum necessary for the construction of this road, under the general road fund, but, obviously, as this is Federal land, the State can not provide the other half of the expenditure. Therefore this road stands in the position of having two ends and no middle, because the portion of road running directly through this park will not be improved under Federal or State funds and constitutes a link of unimproved road.

Now, as a matter of fact, while it is not possible of mathematical demonstration, the construction of this road through this park would represent a real economy. The road leads from the Narrows, a small station on the railroad to Fort Totten, on an Indian reservation, and practically all of the supplies on this reservation have to be hauled over this road, which ordinarily is in a very bad condition, and a very considerable saving would be made in the facility with which these supplies could be transported if the road is completely improved. But that is not the feature of it in which I am particularly interested. As a matter of fact, this national park conducted by the Biological Survey is the only thing of its kind in a stretch of many hundreds of miles, and to one who appreciates the great distances out there, who knows of the everlasting sameness of the landscape, it is easy enough to appreciate the recreational value of a park of this kind. The recreational facilities offered by this park are the only thing of the kind in this section of the country. Some 11,000 people visited there last year, part of the time under very great difficulties because of the poor character of road leading there. All this would do would be to apply to this park under the Biological Survey exactly the same policy pursued in the national parks and national forests. And I want to appeal to my friend from New York that if he will be good enough to accept this amendment it would be not only a recognition of its essential fairness, but an act of amity and grace.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk of the committee be authorized to change any and all totals to conform with amendments made by the committee during the consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the clerk will be authorized to change the totals as requested.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the food habits of North American birds and other animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry; for investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in connection with rearing fur-bearing animals; for experiments, demonstrations, and cooperation in destroying mountain lions, wolves, coyotes, bobcats, prairie dogs, gophers, ground squirrels, jack rabbits, and other animals injurious to agriculture, horticulture, forestry, animal husbandry and wild game; and for the protection of stock and other domestic animals through the suppression of rabies in predatory wild animals, \$533,290.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 24, page 50, the figures "\$533,290" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$633,290."



The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAPES). The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDSPETH: Page 50, line 24, strike out "\$533,290" and insert "\$633,290."

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if you have the hearings before you and will turn to page 408 you will find that Mr. Henderson, in testifying before the subcommittee, stated that the appropriation—and it is the same this year as it was last year—to save the livestock growers and farmers of the United States from great losses from these pests should be \$662,000. That was brought out by a question propounded by my colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Now, this is one of the most important works inaugurated by the Department of Agriculture. The late and very much lamented Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, who now sleeps beneath his native soil in Iowa, requested of the Budget Committee the very sum that I am asking you to incorporate in this bill to-day, \$633,000. I am going to ask gentlemen, and particularly my friend from New York [Mr. MAGEE] and my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], this question: Who is in a better position to know of the work of the Biological Survey and the work done in eradicating these predatory animals—the prairie dog and other pests? Is it the Budget Committee or the Secretary of Agriculture? Is it the gentlemen down there who have it under their supervision or the chiefs of the Budget? I will ask you in all fairness who is in the better position to estimate the amount required for this important work? In a conversation I had with Secretary Wallace about a year ago he stated to me it was one of the most important of any of the works in his department.

What has been done, gentlemen? I am talking to you gentlemen of the Northwest. This does not affect my State. We have eradicated the wolf, except as it is replenished from the plains of New Mexico. What has it done? It has enhanced the value of every acre of grazing land in the West all the way from \$1 to \$10 an acre through governmental instrumentality.

You may say, "Why not let the ranchmen destroy their own wolves?" I answer, they do form clubs and they have paid bounties for the destruction of the coyotes and wolves. You gentlemen who have public lands, you gentlemen who represent the public-land States that are now affected, should be interested in this. I recently made a trip through the State of New Mexico with my friend the Representative from that State [Mr. MORROW], and I saw scalps of these predatory animals hung upon almost every barn. I want to say to the chairman of the committee that I understand that after a very exhaustive hearing on this matter you found that this was an important work.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We find that it is an important work, and I think we have made a very liberal appropriation for it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I disagree with the gentleman on that, because the gentleman's committee did not give the amount requested by the Secretary of Agriculture, \$633,000. I contend that the man who had the work under his immediate eye was in a better position than this Budget Bureau down here to judge of what was required to rid the country of predatory animals. It is not only predatory animals, but other pests as well. Throughout the West the prairie dog has been exterminated. He has been known to destroy whole sections of land, and the rat and other rodents are also destructive.

I say to you, gentlemen, in all seriousness that this appropriation should be voted because it is the same amount as that which Mr. Wallace, the late Secretary of Agriculture, after mature deliberation said should be incorporated in this bill. I sincerely trust that you gentlemen who are interested throughout the Northwest will state whether or not it has been a benefit to the livestock grower in your section in the last 10 years. Sheep throughout the United States have increased in number from 37,000,000 to 47,000,000, largely due to the fact that the predatory animals which preyed upon them have been eradicated.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have five requests for five minutes each and I want five minutes myself. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 32 minutes and that those Members who have indicated that they want time be permitted to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all

amendments thereto be limited to 32 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] is recognized.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the Department of Agriculture is contemplating an increase in the fees to be charged grazers upon the forests which will approximate 75 per cent and in some cases 100 per cent.

Of course, personally I do not agree with that policy. I earnestly hope that the department will not put into effect this proposed increase in the fees. If that policy is carried out, it will work an additional hardship upon the stock growers of this country, and I am sure, speaking particularly of the cattle raisers, that they can not bear much more expense. But if the Government is to increase the fees, as is now contemplated by the department, surely it ought to help in so far as it is possible in eradicating the predatory animals which now infest these forests. But whether the grazing fees are increased or not, this good work should go on. As has been pointed out, it is conservatively estimated that the Government saved to the country over \$7,000,000 last year. This work is now progressing rapidly. In many sections of the country these animals have been eradicated. It has been shown that in many cases when left to the trapper locally the work is not done as well as it is done under the supervision of the Biological Survey. They send their trapper into a given section and try, as far as they can, to completely clear it of these predatory animals. They can profitably use more money. They have the men in the field. It is economy to continue the work with the force they now have and to increase it. They need this additional \$100,000. They will more than give it back, many times more, through a decrease in the number of animals killed. If their present plans are carried out and the grazing fees are increased—which I hope will not be done—then it is the duty of the Government to fight these pests. If we are going to require our stock raisers to pay an additional fee, amounting in some cases to 100 per cent increase, we ought to adopt a broader policy of making the ranges as safe as we possibly can.

Gentlemen, this means much to the stock growers of the West; it means much to those who have permits upon the forests of this country, and I feel it would be adopting a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy now, while the field force is at work, if we handicapped them and prevented them from clearing up these forests and grazing lands from the predatory animals. Let us finish the work as soon as we can and give the department every dollar it needs.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. There is not a movement to curtail the service any further than it is now being carried on, is there?

Mr. COLTON. This item as it now stands will prevent the department from having the amount of money which it requested to do this work. Those who know best have asked for more. While they are doing such effective work, why limit them?

Mr. WILLIAMSON. But they will have as much as they had before.

Mr. COLTON. Yes; but they need more, and can effectively use it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there are no Government trappers in my district, hence it is little affected by this amendment, but I happen to know that in several districts in the State of Texas, in that of Mr. GARNER, in that of Mr. WURZBACH, and in that of my colleague, Mr. HUDSPETH, this is a very much-needed appropriation. There are not only many coyotes there but there are many timber wolves still left there, which not only kill young calves but sometimes yearlings and colts. There are still some panthers and mountain lions left in parts of those districts and there are still some of these big catamounts left that prey upon flocks. They need some protection. I think it is money well spent along that line to increase this appropriation. As has been said, there was \$11,000,000 worth of property saved through the expenditure of the small sum that the Agricultural Department used last year. I think that is quite a return from throwing bread on the waters by Congress; quite a return for the Nation.

I am in hopes the committee will see fit not to fight this proposition. It does not mean anything to New York. There are not any timber wolves left up there. It does not mean anything to some of the other States, but to the States of New

Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and Texas—to the cattlemen of those four States, at least—it means much, and while it affects my district very little, it affects vitally many other districts in the United States. I hope the extra money will be allowed.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not wish to appear in the position of being a looter of the Treasury when things come up that have to do with the western part of the United States. This is a matter, however, about which I have, I think, more than the ordinary amount of information. I was for a good many years in the Forest Service, being first a ranger and later having charge of some of the national forests of the West and cooperating in work of the nature provided for here. The work was carried on by the Biological Survey, but to some extent under the cooperation of the Forest Service.

There are certain things in connection with it which we ought to bear in mind. We learned during the war that very often after preliminary work leading up to the final stroke of attack it was necessary to mass forces to take a position and thus finish the thing, while if we held back we were likely to lose an advantage already gained. Here is an exactly similar situation. I could tell you personally, if I had the time, of different places in my State of Montana and the West where great progress has already been made, where the work has been brought up to the point where, if there can be a more intensive drive covering the next few years, the predatory animals can be put out of existence.

Mr. Chairman, the West is full of instances in which predatory animal extermination has been brought up to a certain point through the offering of bounties by the stockmen themselves, and then because of a slump in the cattle business or otherwise they found it impossible to continue to pay these bounties, so that they stopped the work or slacked up on it. When they have done that, even for a year or two, the predatory animals make back as an increase in a year or two all that has been gained against them over a period of 5 or 10 years.

The Secretary of Agriculture, who has recently passed away, asked for more money than is put in this bill in order that the work already done might be consolidated and that the final stroke might be delivered to bring an end to this problem.

It would be a matter of economy to the United States to add the \$100,000 being asked for now rather than let the work extend over a greater period of years.

Something has been said to the effect that the stockmen themselves might be able to finish this work on their own initiative. The man who goes out as a private trapper finds it to his advantage, as you will readily see, to leave the young of the wolves and other animals so that there will be something for him to trap again the next year. His interest is not in entirely wiping out these predatory animals. But when the Government trapper is sent in he gets his salary and he does not get any more or less if he does a fine job of it than he does if he does a partial job, but his reputation with his department is that he gets great results. As a result of that spirit I could tell you personally of places in the West where these animals have been pretty well eradicated by Government trappers.

As has been said, predatory animals largely originate on the public lands and in the national forests, so that it is a national duty to help meet the situation adequately until they have been eliminated.

Keep in mind that the elimination of one old wolf saves to the stockmen an average of \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year. It is known that that much damage will be done by an average one of these old wolves. Thus we are doing something here, I repeat, which will be of national importance while we have great areas of public lands until the work is done. We are doing something not only to carry on our stock business but to build up the western country. I hope this amendment will prevail.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, recently I was out in the Bad Lands in South Dakota, nearly all of which to-day constitute and has constituted Government land, and while standing upon the brink of the prairie and looking over into the Bad Lands I saw not less than six coyotes making their way out of a small wooded ravine some 75 or 100 feet below me. In our State we have made large appropriations out of the State treasury for the eradication of predatory animals, and are working in cooperation with the trappers in the Agricultural Department who are there doing this work, and the stockmen of our State have also made very large subscriptions toward a fund having for its purpose the eradication of these predatory animals.

Thousands of dollars worth of damage is being done out in my State every year by coyotes, wildcats, and wolves in the killing of sheep and young cattle. One big gray wolf alone

during the last four or five years is known to have committed damage to the extent of more than \$10,000. A Government trapper got him early last fall.

We have hundreds of thousands of acres of public and of national forest lands in South Dakota. These public lands and national forests are the breeding grounds of the predatory animals in our State, and I believe the additional appropriation asked for ought to be granted at this time. If this service can be prosecuted as vigorously as it has been during the past two or three years we can very largely rid our State of these animals in the next three or four years, provided the Government will do its part in killing off the destructive animals that are now rapidly multiplying on the public domain.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the gentleman make that last statement, that if this service can be followed up for the next three or four years, just as it has been conducted in the past, this problem can be solved. I hope the gentleman is right, and that is exactly what this committee is trying to do—to follow up the service as it has been conducted, giving the same amount of appropriation from year to year, keeping the same perfected organization as a going concern, and doing efficient work.

Two years ago the Bureau of the Budget cut this appropriation \$30,000. Your subcommittee put it back at just what it had been before. A year ago the Budget Bureau again cut the appropriation and your subcommittee put it back to just what it was. For what purpose? To keep the efficient organization this bureau now has operating as it has operated in the past.

What are the facts? The gentleman talks about traps. Traps have practically been abandoned by the department as impracticable and too expensive. But what have they done? They have rendered a great service. They have discovered a poison or have made a poison that is tasteless. For years wolves would not eat poisoned meat because it was bitter, but now they have discovered a process by which you can poison meat with strychnine and make it tasteless, and the wolves readily eat this meat. Therefore the Government has performed its function in evolving an efficient remedy which the citizens of the country can avail themselves of.

There is nothing complicated about putting out poisoned meat. There is nothing complicated about poison so long as you get the proper brand of poison from the Government, and they can do that. So that it strikes me that if each individual ranchman would conduct a systematic poisoning campaign and have his ranch hands, who are familiar with his ranch, and who are familiar with the resorts of the wolves and other predatory animals, put out this poison at such places, they can do a thousand times more good than the 250 men that the bureau has in the field all the time.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. LEAVITT. There are no ranches in the national forests, and the national forests are the breeding grounds of these predatory animals.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I concede that in the national forests the Government should kill out the predatory animals of its own accord and at its own expense, and we have ample money for that purpose. We can not kill them all in one year or two years. We have plenty of money to buy the poison, and we have 250 men scattered throughout these Western States to put out this poison, and they are succeeding admirably. The department states right here in the hearings that the wolves have been practically eliminated. Where they used to go in droves they can hardly find one, and that in many sections coyotes have practically been cleaned out. In other sections that is not true. But as they decrease the number of these animals you want to increase the appropriation. It looks to me as though a decrease of the animals ought to call for a decrease in the appropriation, or certainly not an increase in the appropriation.

This work was commenced in 1916 with an initial appropriation of \$134,825 for that year. This year we have increased the appropriation until they have \$283,993 for this work. That is sufficient. Oh, what has become of the self-reliance, the individual initiative, of the American pioneer? The Government has evolved an efficient remedy by which you can kill these wolves by the thousand. They estimate that last year they killed 100,000 coyotes by poison alone. What has become of the initiative and individual freedom of action of men in protecting their own property and attending to their own business? Are they coming to the point where they are relying upon the Federal Government to hire men and send them out there to trap animals on their private ranch lands? On the



Government land we are carrying sufficient funds to meet this situation. Let the private ranchmen protect their own interests after the Government furnishes them a proper remedy. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is never particularly a satisfying or gracious experience to oppose an amendment increasing an appropriation where good work is being done. The committee recognizes that the work done under this item is very efficiently done and that it is a very valuable piece of work. That fact has been demonstrated not by words but by acts. In the last 10 years the appropriation in the aggregate has been increased from \$110,000 to something over \$500,000. It is a very clear demonstration of the fact that the committee has approved of the work that has been done for the last few years as efficient work that should be continued. The only question now is whether the work shall be continued on the basis on which it has proceeded so satisfactorily for the last few years or whether the time has come when we ought to increase the work. In view of the great progress that has been made, the large number of animals that have been killed, it seems to me we ought to be satisfied to continue the work on the basis that it has proceeded upon for the last two or three years. It has been argued that because the Secretary of Agriculture proposes an increase of \$100,000 in this appropriation that that ought to prevail with the House in determining the amount appropriated. If we were to proceed on that theory, if we were to appropriate in the bill the amount estimated by the various heads of the bureaus in the Department of Agriculture, we should add not \$100,000 but \$4,500,000.

The fact of the matter is what you have here is the judgment of the Budget officer, the judgment of the subcommittee that considered the bill, that the amount here proposed is adequate for the purposes for which it is proposed. As I said, there is no particular satisfaction in opposing an increase of an appropriation under which good work is being done, but if we are to preserve a reasonable proportion between this work and other work done by the department we ought to appropriate the amount recommended by the subcommittee. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the committee to some facts bearing on the paragraph wherein we have appropriated all that the Director of the Budget recommended. In this bill we appropriate \$533,200.

The first appropriation made under this paragraph was in 1912, \$35,000. The sums appropriated for the various years since that time are as follows:

1913	-----	\$43,000
1914	-----	60,000
1915	-----	110,000
1916	-----	280,000
1917	-----	400,540
1918	-----	395,540
1919	-----	394,820
1920	-----	464,440
1921	-----	456,040
1922	-----	477,240
1923	-----	502,240
1924	-----	502,240
1925	-----	508,880

What has been the result? As stated by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] the result obtained by the Department of Agriculture has been very satisfactory. Here is a question which I put to Mr. Henderson, a representative of the department, at the hearings:

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Do the depredations of these animals appear to be decreasing?

Mr. HENDERSON. With respect to the wolves and the mountain lions, there can be little doubt but that that is true. We have reduced the numbers of these larger predatory animals, and in some sections wolves are no longer seen where they used to run in packs, and mountain lions are getting scarcer. Their numbers have been reduced in some regions until they are no longer a serious source of damage. Then coyotes, however, are very abundant in the West. They have very large litters, and they have acquired the ability of taking care of themselves in spite of civilization. They have even extended their range into the eastern part of the country as far as Indiana, Michigan, and, I think, some places in Ohio. We have been able in many parts of the country, where we have been working, to reduce the damage, so that, where the damage to the livestock used to be very serious, it is now quite negligible.

Now you practically get down to the question of eliminating the rodents. When you undertake to destroy the coyotes and all the rats and squirrels of different species, rodents of every name and nature, that is a proposition entirely beyond the province or power of the Government.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman has had his time and I have only a few minutes. The one idea I wish to convey to the committee is that when you get to rodents the communities and localities infested must take some of the responsibility in their elimination. The Government, if it is going into that business, as suggested by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] would need an appropriation of millions. I think that it is high time that this rapid pace toward paternalism should stop and that we ought to conduct business along business lines. We ought to ask the communities and localities affected to cooperate with the Government. Let them expend some of their money in protection of their own private and individual interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired, and the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUDSPETH) there were 27 ayes and 54 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For biological investigations, including the relations, habits, geographic distribution, and migration of animals and plants, and the preparation of maps of the life zones, \$29,455.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As I read this bill there are about \$48,000,000 appropriated for the Department of Agriculture outside of the amount appropriated for roads.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think \$44,200,000.

Mr. JONES. Then let us say \$44,000,000. The Department of Agriculture has done some very fine work, but as a matter of fact nearly everything in this bill strikes at the problem of production. That is not the real problem that confronts agriculture to-day. It has been said over and over again, until it has become almost trite, that the real problem of the farmer is that of distribution, and I believe that as between the two things it would be wiser if we took the entire \$44,000,000 and turned it over to the Agricultural Department with instructions to organize some clearing houses in the centers of population for the purpose of getting the producer and the consumer closer together. I do not know that it would be wise to abolish the things that the Department of Agriculture is doing now, but I do believe that as between the two the far more important thing would be to have a route established around the present method of distributing the products as between the producer and the consumer. I received a letter from a man in Texas in which he told me a few years ago that there was the finest potato crop in his vicinity that he had ever known, that the potatoes were literally there by carloads, that there was no market for them, and that they could not be sold. A local merchant said that there had not been a call for potatoes for a month. I went down the street in Washington and the retailers were selling them at that time at 32 cents for a quarter of a peck, or nearly \$5 per bushel.

Of course, it is of some service to have these pests killed, to have things known that are in the interest of production, but as a matter of fact I think it would be better to have the Agricultural Department so organized that it could, through methods of standardization or some similar means, put in touch the consumer and the producer. I do not believe it would be necessary to have the department go into business. I do not believe it would be necessary to have that department handle many, and perhaps not any, of the products of the farm; but if there were a short cut established by which those who produce, or organizations of those who produce, could get in direct touch when necessary with those who consume, or organizations of those who consume, the products it would act as a check to keep these middlemen in line. I believe if you would take the \$44,000,000, or even \$25,000,000, and establish in various centers of the country marketing agencies for the purpose of getting in touch the producing organizations with the ultimate purchasers furnishing market news, it would be more nearly a proper governmental activity than most of the things colated in this bill. In this way we would do much more to advance the real interests of agriculture, because if the producers of this country could secure a reasonable portion of the prices which the consumer is now paying, agriculture would be on a much more profitable basis than it is to-day.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNYDER). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], who comes from a producing district, has seen fit to take into consideration the conditions in the consuming districts. It is rather discouraging



to housekeepers and the tenement dwellers in my district to read cheerful reports from the Department of Agriculture or to hear that crops are plentiful and that food is abundant, and then when they go marketing in the morning to buy food for their families for the day to find prices so prohibitive that people are unable to give their families proper and sufficient nourishment.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is not very cheerful to them when they have to pay 55 cents a pound for round steak to learn that I sell my beef for 4 cents a pound.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Just think of it; and we do not get much steak for 55 cents per pound; it costs nearer about 30 or 75 cents.

Mr. HUDSPETH. It is not very cheerful for them to know that fact.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No; I should say not. New York City is now building large terminal markets. The cornerstone for a large market in the Bronx district was laid a short time ago. We will also have an enormous terminal market in Brooklyn and one also in Manhattan. These markets will have enormous floor space, storage and refrigerating facilities, and intended for wholesale and retail marketing. If your farmers or your organizations of farmers will take advantage of New York City's terminal markets before the middlemen and speculators get all of the space and monopolize the benefit of those markets, we will be able to establish in one city of the country at least a direct communication between the producer in the rural districts and the consumers in the city of New York. The trouble is in the channels of communication and the many parasitical middlemen between the farmer and the consumer. For instance, you ship to New York to a middleman onions from Texas or potatoes from some other State, or other perishable goods.

They permit those goods to remain in the cars for a day or two in hot weather and then telegraph that they are compelled to sell them because they are deteriorating. Very often they are sold to themselves for a price not sufficient to pay the freight rates. If you can arrange through your cooperative organizations to have space in our new terminal markets, costing millions of dollars, with storage facilities of all kinds, cold and otherwise, it will go a long way toward doing away with the difficulties now confronting us. Under the agricultural laws of our State a farmer shipping into the State is guaranteed his payment, because every commission merchant is under bond, and that law is working out nicely.

Mr. BLANTON. In order to help out the farmers, the merchants of Pauls Valley, Okla., recently pledged the citizens to buy a few turkeys each at 15 cents a pound. Would not the gentleman's constituency in New York like to have some of them at that price?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. We would like to have turkeys, but in New York we could not have them running around in our tenement houses. However, we can take all of the turkeys you can send us for 15 cents a pound, if you can only get them there. I hope you gentlemen who have real agricultural problems will look into our market situation in New York, and I am sure Mayor Hylan and the Board of Estimates of New York City will cooperate with you. I was on the board of estimates when we first appropriated for and approved the plan for these terminal markets, and the purpose was to establish this direct contact. You will have the facilities there, you will have the space there, and any time any of the cooperative organizations are ready to confer with the city authorities, I am sure the mayor, Mr. Hylan, will meet you more than half way.

I believe the plans adopted by my city will work out to our fullest expectation. If your farm organizations or cooperatives will give our plan some study and consideration, I feel certain we have something real in our New York City project.

But let us start now, before the space is taken by the speculating middleman, and establish a direct contact between the agricultural centers and the consuming centers.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigations, experiments, and demonstrations for the welfare, improvement, and increase of the reindeer industry in Alaska, including the erection of necessary buildings and other structures and cooperation with the Bureau of Education, and for the enforcement of section 1956 of the Revised Statutes as amended so far as it relates to the protection of land fur-bearing animals in Alaska,

including necessary investigations in connection therewith, and for carrying into effect the act entitled "An act for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1908, as amended by the act approved June 7, 1924 (Pub. Res. 34, 68th Cong.), \$85,095.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the membership of the committee to the importance of passing some character of bill to give either the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior the right to allot or lease pasture land in Alaska. As it now stands neither department has any right to lease any land. The reindeer business or the breeding of reindeer has grown enormously in Alaska. The climate suits them, the pasture suits them, and a vast private enterprise has developed there in the raising of reindeer. They are being shipped in enormous quantities to the United States and used as beef, but the Government can receive no rental from any pasture or forest land in Alaska. Not only that, the stockmen themselves engaged in this business do not know what to depend upon. They can not get a lease, and they know not how long they will be permitted to graze there, and it is to the Government's interest, and to the interest of the industry of Alaska and this country, that this Congress pass some bill authorizing some conditions under which leases may be made.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. How much of that sort of land is there in Alaska?

Mr. BUCHANAN. A great portion of Alaska. That same statement applies to fur-bearing animals. These people who engage in that industry and who are occupying a piece of land ought to have the right to know how long they will be permitted to occupy it so as to know whether their investment will be justified by the length of time they will be permitted to use the land. I just wanted to call the attention of the committee to that.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend the remarks I made on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing of farm and non-manufactured food products and the purchasing of farm supplies, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm products throughout the world, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the department, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the marketing, handling, utilization, grading, transportation, and distributing of farm and food products, and for investigation of the economic costs of retail marketing of meat and meat products, \$539,107.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last line for the purpose of asking my friend who is in charge of the bill for some information. I suppose the gentleman has followed the reading of the bill. We are on page 58, the paragraph at the head of the page. The appropriation in that paragraph is \$539,107. I wish to ascertain why the appropriation for the coming fiscal year is less than the appropriation for the present fiscal year. The appropriation for the present fiscal year is \$550,988.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is a decrease made by the Director of the Budget, as I understand it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That being the case, I offer the following amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Virginia. On page 58, line 14, strike out the figures \$539,107 and insert in lieu thereof \$550,988.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph relates to the subject of acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with the marketing, and so forth, of farm and manufactured food products. It is generally recognized that this service and the similar service provided a little further on, have proved of very great and growing value, and although the reduction is not large it seems to me that it should not be made. A reduction to any extent will operate to discourage the work that is going on in the States which are cooperating with the Federal Government.



If a reduction, however small, is made, there will be more difficulty in addition to that which is already being experienced by some of the States in doing what they are doing in the interest of the farmers. Again, while I am not a critic of the Bureau of the Budget, having voted for the budget system, I do not believe in the policy of horizontal or arbitrary reductions. I think a reduction ought to be made when there is a reason for it, but where there is no reason for it there is false economy in making it. That should not be the practice. Some of us have been endeavoring to ascertain why this particular appropriation should be cut down to the extent of about \$12,000. If I am to vote for this bill, and of course I shall vote for it, I must cast my vote in the dark so far as this item is concerned, and I do not think that is a course that should be expected of Members of the House of Representatives in the discharge of the obligations resting upon them. I have looked in vain through the hearings for any word from anybody to justify the action that the committee has taken, and in the absence of any information I submit respectfully to my friend from New York and to his colleagues—and I want to get the attention as far as I can of the Members of the House who represent agricultural districts—that we ought at least to maintain the appropriation at the same amount that was appropriated when provision was made for the needs of the Agricultural Department during the present fiscal year.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Just before I yield, Mr. Chairman, I would like permission to couple with my remarks an extract from a letter from the chief of the bureau of markets of my own State and a very brief newspaper clipping which accompanied the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extract from the letter follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND IMMIGRATION,  
DIVISION OF MARKETS,  
Richmond, Va., December 9, 1924.

Hon. R. WALTON MOORE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MOORE: The market news on agricultural products has been carried on cooperatively by the United States Department of Agriculture through the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Division of Markets of the Virginia State Department of Agriculture for a little more than a year.

Attached is a copy of our report for to-day and a clipping from to-day's Richmond Times-Dispatch, carrying yesterday's report and editorial comment on our market news service, which shows how it is being used by that paper. It is now being printed by practically every other large morning paper in the State regularly, either in full or in part, and many of the smaller papers and some evening papers are printing part of it.

We are supplying agricultural teachers with this information, which they are using to great advantage in their classrooms, and we have supplied telegraphic service of several hundred words to shippers who have paid all expense of same.

Because of a reduction in the amount received by the United States Department of Agriculture for market news service during the present fiscal year we were called upon last July to assume an additional amount of the expense of this service, although we had been paying about half the cost, and we are now putting all the money into this we can afford to from State funds.

I am informed by good authority that the present Budget before Congress of the Department of Agriculture provides for a reduction in the amount for market news service of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of about \$10,000. If this reduction is made it will probably seriously cripple the service we have just gotten well started, and which meets not only the approval but the demand of farmers, agricultural leaders, the press, and many consumers of our State. In fact the Federal department considered curtailing the service in the South for a few months in the fall when the reduction was made last year, but I frankly told them that if the curtailment were made at the period suggested by them, which is our busiest marketing season—but which might easily be done for some other Southern States—we did not feel that the service should continue periodically.

Very truly yours,

J. H. MEER, Director Division of Markets.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The following is an extract from an editorial by Richmond Maury, agricultural editor of the Richmond Times-Dispatch:

The State division of markets, cooperating with the Federal department, are giving to the farmers of the State a real service in their daily market news report. This report contains the prices for the day on various markets of the country on products that are of interest to Virginia and South. The service was started in August, 1923, and carries this information throughout the South by leased wires.

At present the State division sends this list daily to 486 addresses, having recently, for economy, reduced the list from 793 persons. In addition to all of the papers of the State, the market report is sent to those persons who can make the most use of it. By means of the papers, this daily market information as collected by an uninterested agency is carried to the producers of the State.

Difficulties in the Federal Budget for 1924 threatened the discontinuance of this service for a part of the year to the southern farmers. Through close cooperation on the part of the State the gap was filled. The Budget for 1925 is now coming under consideration. Means should be provided in the appropriations for the Federal Government to carry its portion of the expense for the full continuance of this service to the South. The service has been developing slowly; it was something new and its worth is just becoming fully appreciated.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This appropriation provides, among other things, for the publication of information as to the economic cost of retail marketing of meat and meat products. Has the gentleman's experience been that we have had any benefit from this source along those lines?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I can not detail what have been the activities of the Department of Agriculture in that direction. I would like to see something done in the direction indicated by the gentleman. I listened with interest to the remarks the gentleman made earlier in the day with reference to the willingness of the authorities of New York to furnish market space to those who are trying to reduce the city prices to consumers. I would like to ask the gentleman whether if a State should apply to the authorities in New York for space to carry on such work it would be furnished? A Member told me the other day that a State itself was contemplating an effort to supervise the final marketing of some of its perishable products.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think the authorities of the State of New York would be only too willing to cooperate and do that very thing.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the members of the committee that this is an actual decrease from the appropriation for the year 1925, and is largely due to a reduction of \$8,123 in the attempt on the part of the Government to reduce the personnel in the department. We hear in the House frequent criticisms to the effect that there are so many employees in these different departments that one can hardly get around; that they are so numerous they are falling over each other. The officials of the Budget are endeavoring to reduce the personnel in this department to the extent of probably two or three or perhaps five. It will not affect the efficiency of the work. This important work will be carried on with the same effectiveness as heretofore.

I do not care a copper cent whether the House restores this item or not. If our Democratic friends want to go on record as saying that when we attempt to reduce the personnel of the department they will try to put it back, on them will be the responsibility.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman please tell us what the department asked for on this item?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I only know what the Budget Bureau recommended.

Mr. WATKINS. Have they cut it?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. It is cut only about \$8,000 in reducing the personnel of the department. That reduction is in harmony with the idea you will find carried out in other paragraphs of the bill, an attempt on the part of the Director of the Budget to reduce the number of employees in the various departments.

Mr. WATKINS. The gentleman does not know, however, what the department asked for this particular item?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The gentleman means what the Department of Agriculture requested?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not know.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understand from the hearings that the Department of Agriculture asked for what they got last year. We do not get anything very explicit in the hearings.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Oh, yes, we do. I will refer the gentleman to the hearings on page 498. I read:

Mr. MAGEE. Now, can we go back to this item, which we passed over, Doctor—marketing and distributing of farm products, 1923, appropriation \$549,628, and this year \$539,107, an apparent decrease of \$10,521. How much increase is due to classification?

Miss CLARK. \$1,360.

Mr. MAGEE. So that you have an actual decrease?

Miss CLARK. An actual decrease of \$11,881.

Mr. MAGEE. How does this amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$321,606, compare with what you are spending now?

Miss CLARK. It is \$8,123 less than we are spending now.

I do not know how to make it clearer.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. That is certainly not a very clarifying statement. From what was said a while ago I understood that \$1,000 of this proposed reduction would be on account of salaries, but beyond that there is a reduction of eight or nine or ten thousand dollars in the item.

The gentleman from New York says he does not care a copper what is done with it. Does not the gentleman think it better to encourage the great work of assisting the farmers in this important matter of marketing their products than to cut down the appropriation and to that extent discourage the work?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. There is no question as to the merit of this paragraph. Everybody agrees to that. I agree with the gentleman from Virginia on this proposition, so that the gentleman from Virginia is not talking to anyone who disagrees with him. The result here is obtained by reducing the number of employees in the department. If he is not in favor of that reduction, I have no objection; but I simply want the House to know what the bone of contention is.

Mr. LANHAM. There is to be no curtailment of the activities?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. No. The idea is just to get rid of a few unnecessary employees. If you are in favor of not reducing the personnel we can not help it. I think the number of employees ought to be reduced in all the departments of the Government. We have made an honest effort to do it.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I want to say to my friend that I am not making any unfriendly attack upon the bill.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not complain of anything that the gentleman from Virginia has said. I only say that I have no contention with the gentleman on the merit of this work. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I was only explaining how this reduction came about.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to refer to what the gentleman said awhile ago of the Democrats taking responsibility for increases in appropriations that are proposed. As to that, when we come to consider matters of this kind and any matter which relates generally to the success of the administration of the Government, I for one lay aside partisanship and endeavor simply to do what seems to me my duty as a Representative.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Members of the House will understand that this bill carries, as to every bureau, a limitation on the amount that can be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

That limitation runs all through the bill and results in a saving in departmental service of over \$100,000.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think materially above that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The estimate showed \$110,000, but we gave them a little leeway in each bureau and made up for the \$10,000. The estimate showed a saving of \$110,000. In this one bureau that cut in the personal services in the District of Columbia saves \$8,123, so that by subtracting that \$8,123 from \$11,881 you leave this item on its merit decreased \$3,758.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I may say to my friend that I can not contest his arithmetic, but that he leaves me, even assuming the correctness of his figures, at a loss to determine why the Bureau of the Budget should have made a cut of between \$3,000 and \$4,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to the gentleman that the Bureau of the Budget has been guilty of that practice in many paragraphs throughout this bill; and this committee, whenever it noticed them, generally or sometimes overrode that practice, because we do not believe in making a little cut and disorganizing a well-organized and efficient service. So far as I am concerned, if the gentleman will vote to make his amendment \$3,758, I will vote for it, so it will leave the department exactly as it is; otherwise I would vote against it, because it is wrong to reduce the personnel in one department in the interest of economy and not reduce it in other departments where it can be reduced and ought to be reduced.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. The testimony discloses this:

How much increase is due to classification?

Miss CLARK. \$1,360.

Mr. MAGEE. So that you have an actual decrease.

Miss CLARK. An actual decrease of \$11,881.

Mr. MAGEE. How does this amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$321,606, compare with what you are spending now?

Miss CLARK. It is \$8,123 less than we are spending now.

Eight thousand one hundred and twenty-three dollars plus \$1,360 amounts to \$9,480 instead of \$11,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman should keep in mind that the reference is to an actual decrease and excludes the classification.

Mr. WATKINS. Then the classification decrease will be the difference between \$11,881 and \$9,480?

Mr. BUCHANAN. When reference is made to the actual decrease it means it has been decreased that much, and not counting the classification.

Mr. WATKINS. What I am trying to get is what is due to a decrease in the personnel here.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Only \$8,123 is due to the personnel, and they have actually decreased the appropriation on its merits \$3,758, so that if you want to put it back where it was and not decrease the departmental service the amount should be \$3,758.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I do this for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to what this paragraph really has in it and what we may expect if this policy is to be followed up. The great address made by the President of the United States in Chicago a few days ago contained no more important feature than that in which he gave emphasis to the matter of extending the markets of the farmers of the country. In going over this whole bill I find that here is practically the only paragraph and the only language which has any connection with the development of foreign markets. Now, if we indicate what we propose to do with reference to the markets of the world by the language that is carried here, it seems to me our policy is hardly in line with the suggestions offered in that splendid address. If it is to be a policy merely of cutting down the employees in the District for the purpose of saving money, I have no quarrel with it. I do want to express my disapproval of decreasing the appropriations made for extending our foreign markets for farm crops. I do not believe either the President or the country desires our work in extending our markets of either agricultural or industrial products curtailed. Here is one place where the flat percentage plan of reduction suggested by the Budget should not be carried out. We ought not to pass this item without having our attention called to the oversight we are making with respect to one very important feature of our great farm-marketing problem, and I have simply risen to call that to the attention of the committee.

Mr. WASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. WASON. Does the gentleman know that the amount carried in this bill is identical with the President's signed Budget to Congress with respect to this particular item?



Mr. KETCHAM. My understanding is that there is a decrease of a few thousand dollars, the principal decrease being in the amounts provided for employees in the District.

Mr. WASON. This is the exact amount of the Budget.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KETCHAM. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. We have not cut it at all. We have acted in accordance with the direction of the Budget.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I say this? I am finding fault with making the horizontal cut apply to this very important item in this bill. There is not a more important one in the whole bill than this, and here we are quibbling over a few thousand dollars in connection with it.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. KETCHAM. Certainly.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. You were talking about the suggestion which the President has made. We have done what the President has directed. That is the only point I am making.

Mr. KETCHAM. Has the gentleman any means of knowing whether the same policy is to be followed in connection with the subcommittee having in charge the appropriation for the Department of Commerce?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not know anything about the work of that subcommittee, because I am not a member of it.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KETCHAM. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. JONES. I might suggest that maybe they are trying to save enough money to build another battleship to sink.

Mr. KETCHAM. Of course that is facetious and is immaterial to this matter.

At the same time, I do insist, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that we are passing over a most important item in this bill with a lack of appreciation of the value of this great feature of the work of the Department of Agriculture. I most heartily approve of the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Virginia, making the amount equal to that being expended this year for actual field work in extending our foreign markets for farm products.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Gentlemen of the committee, we have been reading a good deal in the papers recently, and there has been a good deal of agitation with reference to what is to be done for the betterment of agriculture. I ask the indulgence of the House for making a few observations. This I deem the proper place in the bill.

In so far as providing credit I think every student of the economic problems of the farmers must agree that that need has been pretty well taken care of. Besides while proper credit is necessary, its value, what may be expected therefrom, has been much misunderstood, much overestimated. In so far as the marketing of those commodities with regard to which the farmer produces a large exportable surplus and what determines the general price, I believe that every student of these problems will agree that Mr. Dawes has told the truth. And, by the way, there may have been other important Republican officeholders and politicians who have told the growers who produce soft wheat and the meat growers the truth with regard to what determines their price, but I do not know who they are. He is the only one I know of. I congratulate him. When he said that the domestic price of commodities, of which the farmers produce a considerable exportable surplus, is determined by the price received in the free markets of the world, he told the truth about it.

We come then to this phase of the agriculture problem—the sale and distribution end of agriculture, which is practically the only place, if we are to maintain the existing tariff policy, and it seems we are to do it, where anything can be done for the farmers. That is all there is to it.

Of course, production and preservation of soil fertility are important and never will be overlooked, but the nerve center of agriculture is not located there. I congratulate the President on having arrived at the point where the nerve center of agriculture is located—at the sale and distribution end of agriculture. I congratulate him and the country on that fact. He says there is the place to get results.

In order to induce the farmers of this country properly to preserve their soil and properly to take care of production, it must be made profitable to the farmer to do it. Make two blades of grass worth more than one was, and it will not be so hard to induce farmers to adopt methods which will have that result and preserve the fertility of the soil while they are doing it.

I believe, too, that every student of the economic problems of the farmer will agree that, aside from the assistance which he can get from cooperative marketing associations, we must bring about a condition under which it will be made possible to deal in agricultural commodities on paper. In order to do this they must be standardized, so that they can be bought and sold by their descriptive trade terms. It seems to me clearly a fact that we must bring about a condition under which agricultural commodities will move under prior sale from the point of first or secondary concentration to the point of need in response to the requirement for need. This never will be possible until we standardize agricultural commodities with reference to the requirement for need.

I criticize the present method of standardization. It does not have the right objective. We have a system of standardization intended to meet the requirements of the merchant. We must continue to develop our system of standardization until each considerable quantity of a commodity possessing distinctive characteristics that are determinative of the use to which it is best adapted shall have a trade term of its own, so that it can be bought under that trade term by those who want exactly that grade and quality for a specific use.

We need in America not only this system of standardization, but we need our system of standardization, our warehousing system, our Departments of Agriculture, Federal and State, and our cooperative marketing associations so organized as to make it possible for a man down in the Rio Grande Valley, for instance, in my country, or a group of people who have a marketing unit of a given agricultural commodity, while it is still in the Rio Grande, to put it in trading contact with the general market. In order to do this, of course, there must be a spot produce exchange, a place where these actual commodities may be actually listed for sale and sold by their descriptive grade terms. There is not a thing which I have suggested which has not been proven by actual test to be sound except their coordination. That has not been done. That is the only sensible objective, and it seems to me the only way we have a chance materially to reduce this spread between the producer and the consumer we have heard so much about.

The idea of sending these perishable articles abroad in the land to find a market, sending them into concentration centers and holding them there under refrigeration at great expense and then shipping them back, frequently over the same route they have come, is entirely wrong. We have had commissions and investigations and reports and speeches galore, charts by the mile, and the same old set of threadbare figures over and over showing spreads, and so forth. The thing to do is to attack this spread where it is located. One way to reduce freight charges is to move these commodities under prior sale from the point of production to the point of use. That will stop congested markets at one place and inadequate supply at another. That will afford the merchant a chance to reach the primary market and at the same time will give to consumers and producers a route around the private controlled avenues of distribution by which they can establish trade contact with each other. That is a better safeguard against unnecessary intervening profits than would be any legislative prohibition. That would tend strongly to hold the total of intervening profits to the basis of economic value of the service rendered. I can not discuss this phase further. I want to illustrate what I think can be done. It is my opinion, if I may be pardoned for expressing an opinion, that the time ought not to be far distant when a man who has a feeding pen of standard-bred cattle will be able, while those cattle are still in the feeding pen, to put them in trading contact with the markets of the world to sell them by grade. When that is so then we will have reached the point that we all desire to reach; namely, the point where the farmer when he comes to sell his commodity will have an equal trade advantage with the man who buys.

When he ships his cattle in to the stockyards where they are held at high expense—maintenance, shrinkage, and so forth—he has got to sell soon at whatever price will be offered. That is true with reference to the other agricultural commodities. I would like to discuss some other phases of this general subject. The working out of what I have suggested will be difficult, of course. It is a big thing, one not easily accomplished, but we ought to come in off of these cold trails and tackle the job. I know it can be done.

Of course, I can not discuss this big subject in this brief time, which is now expired. I ask the privilege of extending my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], I offer a further amendment to the paragraph of the bill under consideration which is designed to substitute for the figures in the bill, which are \$539,107, the sum of \$542,865, which, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has stated, seems to be the amount that ought to appear in the bill unless there is to be an arbitrary reduction.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I will accept the suggestion of my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moore of Virginia: On page 58, line 14, strike out the figures "\$539,107" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$542,865."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, compiling, abstracting, analyzing, summarizing, interpreting, and publishing data relating to agriculture, including crop and livestock estimates, acreage, yield, grades, stock, and value of farm crops, and numbers, grades, and value of livestock and livestock products on farms, in cooperation with the extension service and other Federal, State, and local agencies, \$472,910: *Provided*, That \$65,360 shall be available for collecting and disseminating to American producers, importers, exporters, and other interested persons information relative to the world supply of and need for American agricultural products, marketing methods, conditions, prices, and other factors, a knowledge of which is necessary to the advantageous disposition of such products in foreign countries, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, including the purchase of such books and periodicals as may be necessary in connection with this work: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for any expense incident to ascertaining, collating, or publishing a report stating the intentions of farmers as to the acreage to be planted in cotton.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I noticed a statement in one of the New York papers the other day by a Mr. Callander, who, it seems, has charge of the estimates of cotton production, in which he rather advocated the deferring of making any estimate of cotton production until August 1 or August 15. Did he appear before the committee and make suggestions along that line?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Callander appeared before the committee, but I suggest that the gentleman from Texas put his question to his colleague Mr. BUCHANAN, who is a cotton expert.

Mr. JONES. Under the law that exists at the present time the reports begin the 1st of July and are published every two weeks thereafter through the cotton-producing season. Of course, any estimates made before the time that the crop matures are in a great measure matters of conjecture, because the pests that frequently infest the cotton have not yet gotten in their full work. I notice that Mr. Callander made a speech before some cotton organization in New York, in which he said it was the opinion of the department that no estimate should be made before the 1st or probably the 15th of August; that at that time it would become apparent how well the cotton was going to mature and develop. I assumed that he was going to suggest to the Committee on Agriculture that it was unnecessary to make any estimate until that time. He did not say he was going to do so, however.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That question did not come before the committee; if it had, I would not have agreed with it.

Mr. JONES. He, as I am informed, is the man who has charge of giving out the data and final estimates. He is reported to have made this speech in which he advocated doing away with the estimates because of the fact that up to that time it was largely guesswork. In justice to him I will state that he did not take that position absolutely, but, rather, left the impression that that was his idea.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not altogether guesswork; they have the acreage and they give the condition of the cotton week after week and month after month. Of course, as the gentleman says, it may be destroyed by pests at any time.

Mr. JONES. According to his statement it becomes more apparent about the middle of August and the estimates are more reliable. I am not quoting Mr. Callander but I am giving it in substance as it appeared in the paper. Here is the idea they seem to have: Frequently in July and August the conditions give promise of making a much larger crop than they do about the time the crop matures. The estimates therefore are likely to be larger, and this is just prior to the time when the cotton is to be put on the market, just as the cotton begins to come into the market. Then if the estimates are large, the price will likely start at a lower basis than it would if they waited and gave the estimates later.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As a matter of fact, it might be just the reverse.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, was it not just the reverse this year; was not the estimate in July less than that in August?

Mr. JONES. There have been cotton estimates for nine years, and in seven of those years there has been an overestimate of more than a million bales. In nearly every month of the seven years there was an overestimate. I know, for I put the figures in the Record last year and I secured them from the Agricultural Department. In seven out of the nine years prior to the present year there has been an overestimate and frequently as high as 1,000,000 bales. Now, I confess—I do not know whether the prodding they were given in the committee and the panning in the House and the criticism throughout the country had any effect, but they have been much more accurate this year than formerly.

They have a very difficult task to perform, and I am sure they are improving their method of making estimates from year to year. It is perhaps natural that a good many mistakes would be made the first few years. At any rate, I feel sure that their system at the present time enables them to be more accurate than they were able to be the first few years.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If the gentleman from Texas will refer to page 487 of the hearings he will find where Mr. Callander made this statement:

The situation is this: We do not make an estimate of the acreage of cotton until the 1st of July. It is not the acreage planted. We estimate the acreage in cultivation. There is usually 1 to 3 per cent of the acreage planted, and sometimes a great deal more, which is plowed up and abandoned by the 1st of July. That is discounted. That is not included in the estimate of acreage in cultivation. Then, in order to avoid overestimating in the early part of the season, until some line on what is likely to be abandoned is obtained, which is usually not very much until later in the season, an allowance is made in making our forecasts for acreage abandonment. If in Texas, for example, acreage abandonment is 3 or 4 per cent, or whatever it is, that is allowed for in the early forecast.

Mr. JONES. That has to do largely with the cotton acreage. They also make an estimate of the number of bales of production, beginning July 1. While they use the acreage report in arriving at the estimate for production, they are two entirely different things.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting, publishing, and distributing, by telegraph, mail, or otherwise, timely information on the market supply and demand, commercial movement, location, disposition, quality, condition, and market prices of livestock, meats, fish, and animal products, dairy and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, peanuts and their products, grain, hay, feeds, and seeds, and other agricultural products, independently and in cooperation with other branches of the Government, State agencies, purchasing and consuming organizations, and persons engaged in the production, transportation, marketing, and distribution of farm and food products, \$709,748.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, since I became a Member of this great legislative body I have to the full extent of my limited ability endeavored to secure legislative action that would, at least to some extent, insure to the agricultural classes equality of opportunity and the social and economic justice so long denied them. I have repeatedly called attention to the alarming condition of American agriculture and I have endeavored to show, and I believe I have conclu-



sively shown, that the economic distress through which agriculture has been passing, and from which it has not yet emerged, is not primarily chargeable to the farmers themselves, but is largely the result of legislative favoritism and an abuse of power and privilege by those who arbitrarily and selfishly control the economic forces of the Nation.

It is not my purpose to discuss in detail the concrete cause of the present nation-wide agricultural anemia further than to say that for several years the American farmer has not been able to sell his commodities at a price that would even return the cost of production, much less afford a profit. The purchasing power of the farmer's dollar is very substantially impaired. There is an alarming and unjustifiable spread between the price at which the farmer sells his commodities and the price he pays for his supplies, and this spread is constantly increasing, to the serious economic injury of agriculture. Indeed, for a number of years the farmer has annually faced a deficit and has been living off of the earnings and accumulations of former years. This encroachment on the farmer's capital stock can not continue indefinitely without irreparable injury to the farmer; and, may I say in passing, the shrinkage in the agricultural wealth of the United States in the last four years has been so stupendous that it is difficult to comprehend how agriculture has been able to stand the economic strain to which it has been subjected.

Unfortunately the farmer has ceased to be a factor in the legislative affairs of the Nation. Other vocational groups easily succeed in impressing their demands and will on Congress and the administration, and as a necessary result, practically all the economic legislation in the last half century has had for its object the enrichment of the manufacturing and commercial groups, obviously at the expense of the agricultural classes. No comprehensive and well-considered legislative program for safeguarding the vital interests of agriculture has ever been enacted. Such legislation as has been enacted for the improvement of agricultural conditions has been tardily and grudgingly granted, and has manifestly been fragmentary and incomplete.

Now, in view of the fact that other favored occupational groups control the legislative and economic forces of the Nation, is it not time for the farmers to "stop, look, and listen," and devise plans by which they may be insured equality of opportunity?

In numerous other addresses I have discussed the condition of agriculture, its needs, its proper relation to other vocations, its claims on the Government, and the duty and necessity of the manufacturing and commercial classes giving agriculture a square deal, and permitting it to enjoy a reasonable share of our national prosperity. I have heretofore discussed the aid that should be afforded by the Government and other external agencies. But to-day, prompted by a desire to be helpful, I shall, in the limited time at my command, suggest some things the farmers can and must do for themselves to improve their economic condition.

Farmers must reach an agreement on great economic policies, the recognition and application of which are conditions precedent to the revival and permanent well-being of agriculture. Obviously the selection of these policies require mature consideration. We must analyze existing conditions in the light of past experience and future probabilities. The agricultural brain must function more efficiently, and the agricultural will must express itself more forcibly and definitely before we can hope for substantial relief from present unfavorable conditions.

There is a profound philosophy underlying the profitable activities of the agricultural classes. The farmer must work in harmony with sound economic principles, if he would reap richly where he has sown, and gather largely where he has scattered. We can not defy or ignore the fundamental principles that permeate and vitalize every other successful and profitable calling. We can not run counter to the safe and sane business policies that are the price of success in other vocations.

In the present agrarian emergency, conditions demand the abandonment of slipshod farming and financial methods, a radical reduction in overhead expenses, rigid economy, and intelligent and efficient management. Unless brain is mixed with brawn, the balance at the end of the year will be on the wrong side of the ledger. Farming is as much a business as manufacturing, commerce, and transportation, and there is the same necessity for the use of prudent business methods in farming, and in farm finance, as in these other great occupations.

The farmer's objective is to establish his calling permanently on a profit-producing basis, which can only be attained by the abatement of legislative favoritism and removal of economic

handicaps and by patient industry, intelligent personal supervision, and painstaking attention to details.

The farmer can not conduct his affairs slovenly, extravagantly, or profligately and escape insolvency. He must see to it that the income from his farm exceeds the outgo, and he should never lose sight of the basic truth that he has failed or at least is economically slipping unless the year's business shows a profit. While the present nation-wide agricultural distress is largely the result of pernicious economic policies over which the farmer has had no control and for which he is not primarily responsible, nevertheless very frequently much of the trouble is traceable to unbusinesslike methods, neglect, inattention to details, excessive and unnecessary overhead expense, and, in some instances, to extravagance, speculation, and reckless disregard of safe and sane business methods.

Agriculture is the most important single industry in America, and therefore if it is to be made a profitable calling we should not only draft the keenest intellect in the world of agriculture but the best brain power of the Nation should be requisitioned to aid in formulating methods and establishing benevolent policies by which agriculture may function efficiently and profitably and be established on a stable and permanent basis. We must therefore apply the acid test of reason and common sense to the myriad plans and policies that now bewilder and confuse. We must separate the practical and wholesome from the impracticable and vicious. In the crucible of sound logic and in the blast furnace of reason the economic gold must be separated from the economic dross. We must subject every proposal, every business plan, every suggested remedy to the test of logic, reason, and common sense, for only by so doing can we determine what policies will best promote the welfare of the agricultural classes.

The farmer should adopt a bill of rights declaratory of principles and policies that will insure for agriculture equality of opportunity. We need an agricultural magna charta that will curtail the power and limit the greed of profiteers, abate monopoly, restrain industrial and commercial buccaneers, and prevent a wrongful invasion of the economic rights of those who produce the food that satisfies the hunger of mankind. There must be a recognition of the principle that there can be no worth-while, nation-wide, or permanent prosperity unless agriculture shares in that prosperity. All other vocations must concede the necessity of agriculture being permanently placed in the list of profitable occupations. This agrarian bill of rights, this agricultural magna charta, must be formulated along broad and comprehensive lines and should enunciate well-established economic principles and demand the recognition and concrete application of those outstanding economic policies, on the inexorable operation of which the permanent prosperity of the agricultural classes largely depends. These policies should not be bent and twisted in an effort to make them applicable to every conceivable condition or to furnish a remedy for every imaginary abuse or to protect one from the inevitable consequences of his own folly; but they should embody workable principles, from the just and rational application of which improved conditions may reasonably be expected.

Much of the farmers' trouble results from their failure to act in concert. There is a deplorable lack of unity—an absence of centripetal force that draws, unites, anneals, and solidifies. In the past there has been but little agreement among farmers as to what economic policies will best promote and conserve their interests. The agricultural classes do not always speak the same language, advocate the same policies, or support the same legislative program. Frequently we have ignored simple business principles and immutable economic laws. Ofttimes we have failed to distinguish between cause and coincidence. Even now in this protracted period of agricultural anemia, the farmers, farm organizations, and farm papers are not agreed on the remedies that will afford agriculture either temporary or permanent relief.

In unity there is strength; in division there is discord, weakness, and failure. So long as the farmers of the United States are divided into numerous opposing and contending factions, making war on each other, they can not hope to accomplish anything. Group rivalries, factional undertows, and antagonistic organization cross currents will neutralize their altruistic activities and render impossible the attainment of their legislative and economic objectives. The need of the hour is for unity in our agricultural faith and creed; unity of purpose, unity in principles, and unity in efforts and action. This unity must be real, not merely nominal. It must be more than a rope of sand; something more than lip service or voice loyalty. Farmers must no longer divide into warring factions, but should present a united front, support the same legislative and



economic program, and stand foursquare for policies bottomed on reason, and which appeal to the intelligence and sober judgment of our thoughtful, level-headed, forward-looking farm leaders. They should establish and adhere more rigidly to a definite agricultural creed and confession of economic faith. They must learn to differentiate between good policies and bad policies; between wholesome and practical remedies and visionary and impractical experiments. They need a definite formula or standard, by which to determine the effect of legislative and economic policies on agriculture.

There should be an end to the unseemly rivalry, bickerings, and contention that have divided the agricultural classes into hostile groups and neutralized the energies of the millions constituting the most numerous and important single class of workers in the world. Reason requires that we get together and coordinate our energies and efforts.

The agriculturalists should be as thoroughly organized as the industrial, commercial, and professional classes. The world does not always know what the farmer thinks, what he needs, or what he demands, because, too often, those who speak for the farmers do not speak the same language, give the same diagnosis of agricultural conditions, agree on economic or legislative policies, or accurately reflect the will of the agricultural classes.

Farmers can not secure substantial results or win a worthwhile victory in their present divided condition. Agriculture must have one mind, and one mind only on economic and legislative policies. It must close up its ranks and end the internecine war that has neutralized its influence and rendered its efforts impotent. Without this unity it can not come into its own, or attain a position of vocational dignity and influence.

The farmer suffers not only from lack of organization but he is the victim of organization, reorganization, and disorganization. We have too many organizations assuming to speak and act for the farmer which speak in an unknown tongue and often fail to reflect the farmer's will or protect his interests. Disclaiming any intention to criticize any of these organizations or to disparage their accomplishments or to discuss their merits or demerits, I nevertheless make bold to say that too often the wholesome purpose of these several groups is sacrificed on the sharp edge of envy, jealousy, group rivalry, self-aggrandizement, and, may I say, at times inefficiency. So far as I know all of the many farm organizations are founded on wholesome principles, have altruistic aims, and are designed to promote the good of the agricultural classes, but these organizations have been multiplied unnecessarily. The rivalry between these different farm groups is so pronounced that they are often exceedingly hostile toward each other, thereby neutralizing their influence and making it practically impossible for any of them to accomplish substantial results. Seldom do they feature the same policies or advocate the same legislative or economic program. Ofttimes when they should be united and actively cooperating they are at cross purposes, strenuously combating the plans, policies, and proposals of each other. Each pretends to speak for agriculture, but each represents only a part of a divided house; and a house divided against itself shall not stand.

Congress, in doubt, inquires what do you farmers want? What economic program do you favor? What legislative relief do you demand? To these inquiries frequently the rival farm organizations give no harmonious and clear-cut response. Each offers its own legislative program as a panacea for all agricultural ills and opposes the policies of rival farm organizations. During the recent session of Congress there was more unity and cooperation between the national organizations than usually prevails, but even then they did not speak as with one voice.

Now, something is radically wrong when the great farm organizations are unable to agree upon an economic or legislative program; when, instead of cooperating with one another, they spend their energies in undermining the influence of rival organizations. I am making no charge against any particular farm group, but commending all for the good they have done; nevertheless, it is obvious that we have many more farm organizations than are really necessary to work the will of and to efficiently serve the agricultural classes. Indeed, these farm organizations have become so numerous that they actually get in the way of one another, which makes it extremely difficult for even the best of them to function efficiently.

It would not be so bad if all these farm organizations supported the same economic policies and advocated the same legislative program.

Let us hope that by absorption, union, amalgamation, or by some other fair process many of these rival farm organizations may be eliminated, so we may have only a very few

national bodies to speak and act for the agricultural classes and to interpret and reflect their will. Without such a centralization and unity agriculture can not make its power felt in the never-ending struggle for equal opportunity and economic independence and vocational stability.

The agricultural classes must be actuated and inspired by a militant loyalty and devotion to the best interests of this great basic industry. Farmers should not forget that an injury to one is the concern of all; that what will promote the interests of one farm group will not injuriously affect another farm group; that in unity strength will be found for the grave tasks of the hour; that division and lack of cooperation spell disaster. This cooperation must be more than skin deep. There must be a willingness, if need be, to suffer a little temporary loss in order to establish helpful economic policies, strengthen their organization, and get in a better position to protect our interests in the future.

Too long have the farmers acted on the old adage, "Every fellow for himself and the devil take the hindmost." As a result, and because of this lack of cooperation, the profiteers, monopolists, and special-privilege groups, by sapping its substance, have brought agriculture dangerously close to bankruptcy.

The solution of the agricultural problem is both external and internal. The relief must come from within and without. There are numerous factors in this complicated equation, some of which are under the control of the farmers themselves and some are controlled by the Government and some by the special-privilege classes. The handicaps resulting from legislative discrimination must be lifted. "Big business" must give agriculture a square deal. The manufacturing and commercial classes must cease to exploit and ravish agriculture. The farmer must have a living price for his commodities and a voice in the conference at which the business and economic activities of the Nation are determined. But if all these remedies should be provided much would still remain to be done by the farmers themselves before agriculture would be securely anchored in the lists of profitable occupations.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNITED STATES WAREHOUSE ACT

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States warehouse act, including the payment of such rent outside of the District of Columbia and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$205,060.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 17, strike out the figures "\$205,060" and insert in lieu thereof "\$215,060."

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, as will be observed, this adds \$10,000 to the appropriation carried in the bill. The warehouse act has proven to be one of the most valuable pieces of legislation that has been enacted in the interest of American farmers in recent years. Already many public bonded warehouses have come into existence. The cooperative associations among the farmers are just beginning to learn the value of the utilization of these bonded warehouses. This law has done more to stimulate the cooperative movement among the farmers themselves than any other thing that Congress has ever done.

At the present time the receipts issued by the warehouses are printed on specially prepared paper approved by the Department of Agriculture and printed by a bonded printer. The warehouse receipts issued as evidence of stored farm products are everywhere accepted as the best class of security by the banks, and the local banks have no difficulty in discounting this character of paper with the Federal reserve and rural-credit banks. As a result of the favor in which these warehouse receipts are held as security, the cooperatives of our State have been able to borrow all necessary funds for the carrying on of their legitimate business in handling such farm products as are now warehoused, but under present conditions it is impossible in our State to secure the warehousing of alfalfa seed. In South Dakota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Wyoming, and Montana the production of alfalfa seed has gotten to be an important industry, running into hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Alfalfa seed to-day is sold largely through cooperatives in our State, but we have been unable to take advantage of the warehousing act because the appropriation is so limited that it has been impossible to organize a sufficient personnel to take care of alfalfa seed under the warehousing act.



I have been in conference with the department officials in regard to this matter, and am informed that if there were added to the appropriation the sum of \$10,000 they would be able to add alfalfa seed to the products now being warehoused. With \$10,000 additional the situation in our State and the surrounding States could be properly taken care of.

This is one of the most important items in the bill and I believe the additional \$10,000 ought to be allowed in the interest of the midwestern farmers. It is a small amount, but it seems to be absolutely necessary in order to give the service we need in connection with our cooperatives that are handling alfalfa seed. I hope the committee will approve this amendment. It is asking but a small favor and should be graciously extended.

The cooperative marketing movement among our midwestern farmers is just in its infancy. It is a movement in the right direction and ought to be given every possible encouragement. Wisely managed, it will prove to be the real solution of the farm problem. Every facility should be offered the cooperatives to store grains and seeds in these bonded warehouses, and the least that this Congress can grant is to allow a sufficient appropriation to enable the Department of Agriculture to provide the necessary storage facilities, manned with a sufficient personnel to care for such products as may be offered for storage. Ample warehouse facilities will largely solve the problem of adequately financing our local cooperatives.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, the apparent increase in this item over the year 1925 is \$18,560. Of this amount \$10,560 is for the classification of field employees. An actual increase of \$8,000 is to provide for the rapidly increasing volume of work due to the large number of warehouses which are being licensed under the warehouse act. The number of warehousing products, cotton, grain, wool, and tobacco, has been extended to include corn, potatoes, and peanuts, and preliminary work has been done on beans and dried fruit.

I do not feel competent to say whether this list should be extended to include alfalfa. Probably many Members of the House are more competent to speak on that proposition than myself. The warehouse act is an important act. We recognize that, and we gave the department, apparently, what they wanted. We gave them this increase, as I have said, because of the increasing number of warehouses that are being licensed under the act. I have risen simply to put before the members of the committee the facts as we got them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### COMPLETION OF WOOL WORK

To enable the Bureau of Agricultural Economics to complete the work of the domestic wool section of the War Industries Board and to enforce Government regulations for handling the wool clip of 1918 as established by the wool division of said board, pursuant to the Executive order dated December 31, 1918, transferring such work to the said bureau, \$11,290, and to continue, as far as practicable, the distribution among the growers of the wool clip of 1918 of all sums heretofore or hereafter collected or recovered with or without suit by the Government from all persons, firms, or corporations which handled any part of the wool clip of 1918.

Mr. TAYLOR of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The bill under consideration is one that confers broad powers upon the Secretary of Agriculture, and justly so. As a matter of State pride, I think that it is not amiss at this time to call to the attention of this committee the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Howard M. Gore, is a West Virginian.

There will be a new Secretary of Agriculture after March 4 next. The fine administrative ability of Mr. Gore, recently given substantial recognition by the President of the United States in placing him at the head of this great Department of Agriculture, has been recognized in a greater measure by the people of West Virginia, who have called Mr. Gore to be governor of that State for a four-year period, beginning on the same day that his commission as Secretary of Agriculture is handed back to the President.

For the third time in the history of West Virginia she has been honored by a place in the President's Cabinet, and her place in the sun has been more firmly established. In the higher call of Mr. Gore to the governorship, I feel that the country as a whole loses the services of a splendid administrative officer and that West Virginia is the gainer thereby. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section. If my amendment should prevail, this would save \$11,290. There was a time right after the war when this wool section bureau was necessary, but that time is past now.

What is the use of longer keeping up this business? If you would investigate, you will find that every dollar of this money pays salaries of individuals, continuing them on the pay roll, on and on. I do not see any necessity for keeping on paying for war work that ought to be over. If it is not wound up now, when is it going to be wound up? I do not care to take any further time, but I hope that the committee will let it go out. It is not doing the woolgrowers any good in my section or down in the section of my colleague Mr. HUDSPETH, and it is not doing the woolgrowers of New Mexico or anywhere else any good that I know of.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, we fought out this proposition pretty completely, as gentlemen will remember, at the last session of Congress. The work ought to be completed, and I had hoped that the work would be completed during the fiscal year 1925. The Department of Agriculture claims that it has done all that it can possibly do, and I think it has. That department gave us the inference that the delay was due to the Department of Justice. There are a great many important suits pending, involving large amounts of money. The House, of course, can not force the Department of Justice to go ahead, push these cases, and get a final determination in the courts as soon as possible.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. But I think the department ought to press these suits, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. I want to get the facts before the members of the committee. The Government started in and collected a lot of money from the little fellows, so called, who bought the wool. The total amount collected to date is \$752,930.20. Of that the Government has distributed \$450,235.07. There is approximately \$220,000 in the Treasury which has not been distributed, because the Government does not know to whom to distribute it, neither the names of the persons nor the addresses of those to whom these moneys belong. These moneys eventually will go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, as well as a part of the additional amounts that may be collected. There are claims in the amount of \$724,000 outstanding, and the Government claims that those moneys are owed by a few persons, the large dealers. The question we have to determine now is whether the Government, having pursued persistently the little fellows, will quit on the big fellows. I am not in favor of that policy.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman will remember a year ago when this appropriation was before the House I had something to say in opposition to the appropriation. Now, at the time, I am not certain the gentleman made a definite statement, but somebody handling this bill before the House left me under the impression that there would have to be a decided showing that progress was being made by the department toward winding up this work or the appropriation would be eliminated this year. Now, the gentleman says they have \$220,000 in the Treasury belonging to somebody, but nobody knows their names, nobody knows the addresses of those who are entitled to that sum, and eventually it will go into the Treasury. I want to submit to the gentleman that if we continue to appropriate \$11,000 a year to pay a few salaries in the Agricultural Department that sum of \$220,000 is going to rapidly diminish.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I want to say that I do not concur in that statement, because the more money the Government collects the more money will go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me—I am sure the House will give him more time if he wants it—I understand that, as the gentleman says, the money was collected off the little fellows. Now, the big fellow, the man who owed a larger amount, has refused, the department's demands for payment, and it is necessary to bring suit. I understand that those suits have been brought and are now in the hands or under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Except one.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why is it necessary to maintain exactly the same force, maintain them to sit down and fold their hands in the Agricultural Department, drawing salaries, and so forth, awaiting the disposition of these lawsuits which may drag along for several years?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. They are not doing that. They have their work to do, and the employees in the Department, of Agriculture who have prepared the cases are the only ones who know the facts. They have to prepare the cases and ascertain the witnesses who can be called upon in the trial of those cases. You can not get along without them, and even if this appropriation is not made, I understand that



these persons will still continue in the employment of the Department of Agriculture. I feel exactly about this proposition, so far as winding it up is concerned, as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I do not know what I said a year ago, but I certainly felt as the gentleman expresses himself now. If the gentleman will examine the hearings he will see that I questioned pretty sharply the representatives of the Department of Agriculture who came before the committee. You will find from the hearings that the Department of Agriculture took the position that this paragraph should be continued, and that if it was dropped probably those cases now pending to collect from these big fellows, as they call them, involving some seven hundred thousand dollars, would be dropped. That was the idea expressed by the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. The appropriation is \$11,280. I want to ask the gentleman a question. What about the expenditure in the District of Columbia, that there shall be spent not over \$8,600? That is on page 554 of the hearings. Why is the appropriation larger than the law allows it to spend? I think it should not be over \$8,600 anyway.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. The sum of \$8,600 is what they are expending for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. I understand that is the limit, as your statement implies, beyond which they can not spend.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. No; printing and some other clerical work makes up the difference.

Mr. WATKINS. The difference between \$11,280 and \$8,600?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. I am not criticizing the Department of Justice. I do not know how the House can force the Department of Justice to speed up these cases. All I can do, particularly in view of the existing situation, is to explain what the Government has done in these cases. I think that the Department of Justice ought to take up these cases and push them to a conclusion as speedily as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not mean to intimate that our action here in dropping these few clerks off the pay roll of the Agricultural Department would affect the action of the Department of Justice in these cases? The department will carry on these cases just the same?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is what they say will happen. If you will read the hearings you will see that.

Mr. BLANTON. The Department of Justice is in a bad position if it is interfered with by the fate of these few clerks.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. That is what appears in the hearings.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Does not the gentleman know, from what we have heard, that the collection of this money would not have been accomplished except for the work of the Department of Agriculture in collecting the information?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Exactly.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I find that in the last few months collections have gone on. An amount considerably in excess of this sum of \$11,000 has been collected.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia that in the last year they have distributed a very considerable amount, which I would like to put in the Record. The hearings show that during the year \$57,000 has been distributed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF FOREST-PLANTING STOCK

For cooperation with the various States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and plants in estab-

lishing windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots upon denuded or nonforested lands within such cooperating States, under the provisions of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924, \$50,000, of which amount not to exceed \$2,650 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address some inquiries to the chairman of the committee on the subject of the appropriations on page 70, line 1, and continuing on page 71, just read.

I want to say that I think this is an important undertaking. I have traveled a good many times throughout the States lying between the Capital of the Nation and the State of Kansas, where I live—not as early in my life as I desired, but finally—and I have observed the beautiful wood lots in the State of Indiana and in that "Irish State of Ohio," and I have seen with what great care they have been kept and preserved. It is to me a very interesting subject. Then I have come along here and ridden through the States of Virginia and Pennsylvania and some others of the seaboard States, and I have seen a great waste in timber, thousands of trees lying prone upon the earth. And incidentally it made me think of a remark which a boyhood friend made at one time, to the effect that there were only two things that he hated to do—one was to work and the other was to chop wood. [Laughter.] It seems to me that antipathy is somewhat widely diffused.

But seriously, I would like to ask the chairman what it is proposed to do with this money. I note with some surprise that only \$2,650, in the first item, is to be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia. That seems ridiculously out of proportion, according to my way of thinking, as compared with the other appropriations carried in this bill.

In the second item only \$2,600 can be expended in the District of Columbia. I wonder if the chairman, as a matter of information to this House, could tell the House, especially Members like myself, who are so much interested in this subject and who live in States where there is not so much natural timber, how it is proposed to advance this work. Can the chairman do that? I regret that I have not had time to examine the hearings.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I could not attempt to do that, but I will simply say to the gentleman that we are trying to carry out the provisions of the act of June 7, 1924, known as the McNary-Clark Reforestation Act. No appropriations have been made under that act heretofore. What those who are to carry out the act propose to do, I do not know. We have given the sums recommended by the Budget to supply what is needed to carry out the provisions of the act passed last June.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Well, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to see the same beautiful, well-kept wood lots in the State of Kansas that I see in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois. We can not have them in a day. I suppose it was only a full-grown tree to which some writer referred, apostrophizing those eminent qualities that render human life vigorous and strong, when he said that such and such a man was built like a forest tree, the broad oak, that strikes its roots deeply in the earth, or like the tall cedar, that lifts its head above the other forest trees. Those trees must have been centuries in developing. I would like to have those trees, or trees like them. I wish the gentleman from New York would tell us how we can get those trees. The officials in charge of this service, it is understood, are going to start, perhaps, in a year from now. I would like to ask the chairman to tell us how we can get them.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes in order to answer the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE] that this is what Colonel Greeley, who has charge of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture, said in the hearings:

What we actually expect to accomplish is this: At the present time all of the forest planting in the country amounts to less than 40,000 acres a year; what the Federal Government does, what the States do—



The idea is for the Federal Government to cooperate with the States, of course—

what is done by the farmers, what is done by everybody else—the entire amount is less than 40,000 acres a year, as compared with about 360,000 acres a year in Japan alone. Now, if we get this activity going, even with the \$50,000 proposed for this year, we expect to increase that acreage by at least 10,000 acres a year planted.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Just one moment, please.

And to get that 10,000 acres planted where we believe it will do the most good, namely, on the parts of our farms that are not adapted to agricultural crops but will make good timber crops.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Well, I think the folks over in Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois know all about this. I think their system is perfect, so far as it could be made so, and I want to say to the chairman that our farmers are anxious to cooperate with the Government if they have some information and know how to do it. Now, we are creating a separate bureau for this purpose?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. No. This is not my act. This is the act of Congress. I voted for the act, and I believe the gentleman from Kansas voted for it.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I am trying to find out a little more about it than I know. That is why I have asked these questions.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. It is a new act, and I would suggest that if the gentleman desires more information than Colonel Greeley has given in the hearings he take the matter up with him.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. He knows as much or more about it than anybody else, and he is a very estimable gentleman. But this is a new proposition.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I am already instructed in a degree. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL FOREST LANDS

For the acquisition of additional lands at headwaters of navigable streams, to be expended under the provisions of the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. L. p. 961), as amended, \$1,000,000, of which amount not to exceed \$14,800 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to address myself to the chairman of the subcommittee. Is this appropriation for the perpetuity of the so-called Weeks Act?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I think it was last year or the year before that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], who is a member of the commission provided by this law, made a very elucidating statement before the Agricultural Committee as to what this commission had already accomplished and what it hoped to accomplish. At that time it seemed to be the policy of this commission to buy as much as possible of the hardwood timber watersheds of this country, and my recollection is that he stated at that time that there were tentative contracts for the purchase of a great deal of land, but that the contracts had not been carried out for the lack of appropriations. My recollection further is that year before last you appropriated \$400,000 under this item, last year \$800,000, and this year, under the authorization of the original act, you appropriate \$1,000,000. Does the gentleman think it is the policy of the department to undertake to carry out the Weeks Act by yearly acquiring more of the watersheds of this country?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. I thought I made that clear in my remarks explaining the bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I was not fortunate enough to be present and hear the gentleman's remarks. Is it contemplated by this commission to use the \$1,000,000 carried in this item for the purchase of more land?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. I will repeat briefly what I tried to convey to the House at that time. Under the Weeks Act they have a certain organization and they claim that with the \$400,000 or \$450,000, the amount appropriated, I think, for the fiscal year 1924, it is impossible to keep that organization intact and functioning and at the same time have money with which to purchase land. Now, as I understand it, they claim that on the basis of \$1,000,000 they can keep that organization functioning and purchase each year about the amount of land the commission thinks the Government ought to purchase annually. That is my notion about it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Do the hearings disclose or does the Agricultural Department indicate to the committee what character of land will be purchased during the ensuing year, and in what part of the United States?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes. If the gentleman will refer to page 617 of the hearings he will find a table showing in what States the purchases have been made, the number of acres, the average price, and the value. The States are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Maine, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Practically that statement is already in the hearings before the Agricultural Committee—that is, as to what they have already purchased. I am not so much interested in the geography of this as I am in the character of watersheds they propose to buy and in territory where there is hardwood timber, and I was wondering whether it was the purpose of the commission to buy any watersheds of hardwood timber out of this \$1,000,000 appropriation. I certainly hope the commission may see fit to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### PASSENGER-CARRYING VEHICLES

That not to exceed \$150,000 of the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$46,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles, and that such vehicles shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of motor trucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to purchase, from the funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. L. p. 212), not to exceed \$35,000 for motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles to replace such vehicles transferred under authority of the acts of February 28, 1919 (40 Stat. L. p. 1201), March 15, 1920 (41 Stat. L. p. 530), and November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. L. p. 212), from the War Department and retained and used by the Secretary of Agriculture in the construction and maintenance of national forest roads or other roads constructed under his direct supervision which are or may become unserviceable: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall on the first day of each regular session of Congress make a report to Congress showing the amount expended under the provisions of this paragraph during the preceding fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may exchange motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for vehicles, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, or boats purchased by him.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he has any figures showing how many trucks the War Department has turned over to the Department of Agriculture that have been distributed among the States for this highway work and whether they continue to have any of these trucks on hand. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think most of those trucks are worn out.

Mr. BRIGGS. It was my impression some time ago when we passed an act providing for the transfer of these surplus trucks in the hands of the Army to the Department of Agriculture for distribution among the States there were quite a number of them on hand, and I was just wondering whether they have all been distributed or not. My impression is the War Department stated they turned over all they had to the Department of Agriculture, and I wanted to get some idea about what that distribution was.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I think they were turned over and they are now worn out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to the gentleman that all the trucks that have been declared surplus have been disposed of and the only thing remaining on hand as surplus is explosives. There may be some more trucks on hand, but they have not been declared surplus, and therefore they can not touch them.

Mr. BRIGGS. The War Department tells me they have not any more trucks for disposition and that they have turned them all over to the Agricultural Department.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.  
The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

For carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, to be expended in accordance with the provisions of said act as amended, \$76,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which amount not to exceed \$454,971 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, being \$25,000,000, the remainder of the sum of \$50,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923; \$35,700,000, the remainder of the sum of \$65,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924; and \$15,300,000, being part of the sum of \$75,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, by paragraph 1 of section 4 of the act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1923, approved June 19, 1922.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have been asked to make a statement relative to the appropriation for public highways; in fact, I have received some criticism for my action on the committee, for which I have no apology to make. I am willing to stand by my action through thick and thin.

In a general way let me call the attention of the House to the appropriations for highway construction since the commencement of this work.

In 1917 the first authorization for appropriation was \$5,000,000; in 1918, \$10,000,000; in 1919, \$65,000,000; in 1920, \$95,000,000; in 1921, \$100,000,000; and in 1922, \$75,000,000.

In all of these years the same year the authorization was made Congress appropriated the full amount of the authorization, so that appropriations could not get behind because the full amount authorized and the full program contemplated by the law was appropriated.

In 1923 we began to get behind. For that year Congress authorized \$50,000,000 to be appropriated, but we only appropriated \$25,000,000, leaving a balance to be carried over and appropriated the next year or in future years of \$25,000,000. In the year 1924 the law authorized us to appropriate \$65,000,000. However, we did not appropriate but \$29,300,000, leaving a balance of \$35,700,000 to be carried over for future years, in addition to the \$25,000,000 carried over from the year preceding. In 1925 the law authorized us to appropriate \$75,000,000, when, as a matter of fact, we appropriated only \$13,000,000, leaving \$62,000,000 to be appropriated in future years.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. According to the bill, as I understand it, at the bottom of page 77, there was appropriated for the year 1925 all but \$15,300,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. For the year 1925 we appropriated only \$13,000,000, leaving \$62,000,000 to be carried over to this or future years.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman listen to the reading of the bill, as reported by your committee:

And \$15,300,000, being part of the sum of \$75,000,000 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925.

As I understand the action of the committee, you are withholding the \$15,300,000 of the \$75,000,000 that has already been appropriated.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But you segregate the years. It has all come to one total now, and the grand total is \$122,700,000 that we are behind for the past three years in our appropriations.

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; that is possibly true. I am only taking the report of your committee on the last authorization for 1925.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The misunderstanding is in one year being segregated.

Therefore, gentlemen, when your subcommittee met this year we were confronted with the situation that there was \$122,700,000 unappropriated what we were authorized to appropriate in three preceding years.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield for a question for the purpose of getting his comment upon a few paragraphs of the report of his committee?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman why the committee reported \$4,000,000 less than the estimate submitted in the Budget. I suppose there is some good reason for that. Then I would like to ask the gentleman to state

a little more exactly than is done in the report what is meant by this statement in the report:

During the fiscal year 1926 if the Bureau of Public Roads discovers that the amount made available by this bill is insufficient Congress will be in session and a deficiency appropriation can be estimated and appropriated for.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will answer the gentleman in the course of my remarks. We were confronted with the fact that in the authorization for the past years we did not appropriate the \$122,700,000. The Bureau of the Budget returned estimates for \$80,000,000. On examination of the witnesses we find that the department will actually pay out in withdrawals from the Treasury this fiscal year \$90,000,000, leaving, in round numbers, \$4,000,000 for next year. The Department of Agriculture in its estimates concluded that it would take \$90,000,000 to meet the actual withdrawals from the Treasury for the fiscal year 1926. The Budget recommended \$80,000,000, and with the \$4,000,000 would be \$84,000,000 to meet the estimates of the department of \$90,000,000. We did not appropriate that amount. We appropriated \$76,000,000. The fact is, gentlemen, there is going to be a deficiency anyhow. If you appropriate the Budget estimate of \$80,000,000, there is going to be a deficiency of \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000. So that it does not make any difference whether you have a deficiency of \$14,000,000 next year or a deficiency of \$6,000,000 to \$10,000,000.

Now, what do we mean by the statement in the report which the gentleman from Virginia has read. It means this, that whether we appropriate in this bill seventy-six million or eighty million, that the Department of Agriculture believes there will be a deficiency, it means that the Bureau of the Budget believes that there will be a deficiency, and if there is a deficiency that it will be promptly submitted by the department to the Budget, approved by the Budget, favorably reported by the Appropriation Committee, and passed by this House with no injury to the highway construction of the United States. That is understood on all sides.

I understand that the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MAGEE] does not believe that there will be a deficiency, but in this fiscal year they have spent up to December 1 fifty-three and one-half million dollars, or more than \$10,000,000 a month. Undoubtedly for the next fiscal year we will need at least \$90,000,000 or perhaps more, and we carry in this bill \$76,000,000 and the \$4,000,000 left over from last year makes \$80,000,000, and that will carry us up until March, 1926, before the money is exhausted, and as the next Congress convenes December, 1925, we will have ample time to pass a deficiency appropriation. I wanted the House to understand my action in the matter, and to understand that in this bill for the fiscal year 1926 and the appropriations for good roads for the fiscal year 1927, we will have to provide \$122,700,000 to pay our contractual obligations to the cooperative States, which indebtedness was incurred during the fiscal years 1923, 1924, and 1925; so that the fiscal years 1926 and 1927 have inherited from the fiscal years 1923, 1924, and 1925 this indebtedness of \$122,700,000 on good roads alone. Let us hope any other bequests will be a blessing, not a burden.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to say for myself that I voted for the \$80,000,000 in this bill because in my judgment that will be sufficient for the purposes of the department. The claim of an alleged deficiency did not have any weight with me, and I will tell you why. In 1924 it was estimated that \$85,000,000 would be necessary. As a matter of fact they used only about \$80,000,000. In other words, their estimate was \$5,000,000 above what they actually used. In the next place it seems to me that the House has at least given an indication that in its judgment by the passage of the Dowell bill \$75,000,000 a year is about the amount that we ought to appropriate. The Dowell bill passed last session called for an expenditure of \$75,000,000 for each of two years from July 1, 1925. I voted to give the department the \$80,000,000, \$5,000,000 above that sum. I find no fault with the recommendation made by the committee. I read with great interest after the representative from the Department of Agriculture appeared before us the remarks made by the chief of the bureau, Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, on December 4, 1924, and published in the Evening Star on that date, at the Fourth Annual Convention of the Highway Research Board. This is what Mr. MacDonald is reported to have said:

Scientific research into the processes of making lasting roads has developed new and economical practices, which should result in cutting the road-making bill of the Nation down by nearly one-fourth. Thomas H. MacDonald, chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, told the Highway



Research Board at its fourth annual convention, which opened to-day at the new home of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council.

Application of time-saving methods by contractors in road construction work, by overcoming of delays and use of proper machinery, would save between 20 and 25 per cent of the total spent on road construction, Mr. MacDonald estimated. Applied to the billion dollars he said was annually spent on roads in the United States, this would represent an enormous saving to the taxpayer.

Whether there will be a deficiency or not I do not know. If there should be a deficiency, as my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has stated, it can be taken care of, but it would not surprise me, looking into the future as far as 1926 and taking the statement of Mr. MacDonald at 50 per cent of its face value, if we should have a surplus of ten or fifteen million dollars. In other words, if such savings can be effected as he intimated at this convention, it is possible that in 1926 we may not spend more than \$60,000,000 or \$65,000,000. We are safe anyway. I simply wanted to make my position clear.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it contemplated by the committee making this appropriation that there will be a deficiency?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. It is not so contemplated by myself.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not the fact that there should be no deficiency in these appropriations if they are made properly?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I can only tell the gentleman why I voted for the appropriation. I can not speak for the other members of the committee.

Mr. DOWELL. I do not understand why the Committee on Appropriations should come before the House with an appropriation and intimate that it is the understanding that there will be a deficiency in the appropriation. I think they should hold the department to the actual appropriation, and if we are going to get anywhere it seems to me there must be a limitation to the actual appropriations made. I do not understand about this intimation that this appropriation is made and that there will be a deficiency to come before us later.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I have not made that intimation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I invite the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to line 9 on page 74, where the following language occurs—

together with any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for this purpose.

Are such sums as that included in the total in the last line, line 5 on page 78 of the bill? It occurs to me it would be very difficult, indeed, for us to keep up with the obligations of the Government if many such appropriations were carried as are carried in line 9, page 74. I wonder whether there are many occurrences of that kind throughout the bill?

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I do not know that I understand the gentleman exactly.

Mr. HASTINGS. On page 74 you appropriate the unexpended balance that has heretofore been appropriated for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question. My information is that in the last deficiency bill was an item of \$3,500,000. Whether that has all been expended I do not know, but we wanted to provide in this paragraph that in case of an emergency any unexpended balance of such appropriation carried in that deficiency bill would be available.

Mr. HASTINGS. It would be continued.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. By this language.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may return to page 30, line 13, of the bill, for the purpose of permitting the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] to offer an amendment relating to the disease called nailhead rust attacking tomatoes. I do so for this reason. I am a member of the subcommittee on deficiencies of the Appropriations Committee. This matter was brought to the attention of the deficiency committee while considering the deficiency bill at the last session. It was then earnestly presented by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS], and it appeared from statements made to the committee then that this disease was making great ravages on the tomato, and that tomato growers in Florida had lost possibly a million dollars as a result of it. The Department of Agriculture wanted and was given \$10,000 on a three-year program, as I now recall. That \$10,000 was appropriated, and it seems to me, and I am told that the Agricultural Department so

states, that unless another \$10,000 is appropriated for next year on this three-year program the \$10,000 which has already been appropriated, which is doubtless in process of expenditure, will be wasted. They think they can control this disease, and for the reasons stated and the fact that this disease is now being given consideration by the Department of Agriculture, and it having originally recommended this program, I ask that the gentleman from Florida be permitted to offer this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to return to page 30 of the bill, line 13. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, let us have the amendment read so that we will know what it is. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is an item that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] spoke to me about. He said it first came up at the time of the preparation of the deficiency bill. I am not a member of the subcommittee on deficiencies, and as I understand, and as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will confirm, if true, an item of \$10,000 for this purpose was put into the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For this year.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Precisely; and what is desired now is to put a similar item in this bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For next year.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I told Mr. SEARS of Florida that my attention not having been called to the matter and no hearings held by the committee, yet if some member of the deficiency committee would come on the floor and explain it to the Members I would not object to turning back and putting it in the bill, and I have no objection so far as I am concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the amendment be read for information. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SEARS of Florida: Page 30, after line 13, insert: "For investigation, eradication, and control of the tomato disease commonly known as nailhead rust, \$10,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. I withdraw the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to page 30, line 13? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair would suggest before returning and taking up the matter that there is one line left which the Clerk has not yet read, and the Chair suggests that the line be read first in order to complete the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Department of Agriculture, \$124,637,715.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. I understand that the Clerk was authorized to correct any and all totals.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, after line 13, insert: "For investigation, eradication, and control of the tomato disease commonly known as nailhead rust, \$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SEARS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] for requesting unanimous consent that I be permitted to offer the amendment—

For investigation, eradication, and control of the tomato disease commonly known as nail-head rust, \$10,000.

Last year it was estimated the growers of tomatoes lost approximately \$1,000,000 because of this disease. The amount asked for is small, but the Department of Agriculture is satisfied that by appropriating said amount annually, not to exceed three years, they will be able to cope with this disease.

Last year the growers, out of their own funds, spent several thousand dollars trying to discover some method of control; but, not having the facilities that the Government has, they did

not make much progress. Realizing as I do the importance of finding some way to eradicate or at least control this disease, I sincerely trust the amendment which I have offered will be adopted.

I understand the chairman of the subcommittee will not oppose the amendment and, therefore, I will not take up more of your time.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TREADWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 10404, the Agricultural appropriation bill, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment; if not, the Chair will put them in gross?

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAGEE of New York, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker lays before the House the following resignation.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1924.

Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET,

Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, effective at once.

Very respectfully yours,

WILLIAM B. BOWLING.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

S. 116. An act to amend section 196 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 933. An act to provide for the examination and registration of architects and to regulate the practice of architecture in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1343. An act to authorize the widening of Fourth Street, south of Cedar Street NW. in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

#### AUTOMATIC TRAIN CONTROL

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the bill H. R. 9773.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this opportunity to extend my remarks on H. R. 9773, a bill I introduced in the last session of Congress, for the one reason that it is a humanitarian measure and a great protection to the employees of the railroads and the traveling public, and Congress should be fully advised. I have no interest in any way in any of the train-control devices which are in existence, and my only thought in bringing this matter to your attention is that the people should be given the protection which train control affords. It is a fact that the only device that has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission is the Regan automatic train-control device, and since this name is used frequently in the reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission, it will have to be referred to many times. I want to explain now that the plea of the railroads and the newspaper propaganda against this device makes it very embarrassing for anyone who has taken an interest in the proposition. I know that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been embarrassed over the use of this to such an extent that it has become almost a crime in the eyes of some people to mention the name of the Regan device. I again state that I have no

pride in the name of any device in the name of Regan and have no interest other than the humanitarian end of the proposition. I will have to say many times that the Regan device is the one which has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission; all other devices have so far not been approved; and it is the one I have myself inspected and seen its successful operation.

Mr. Speaker, in order to explain the necessity for the approval of H. R. 9773, it will be necessary for me to state briefly the history of train control, and I am laying before Congress information I have gathered principally from the records of the Interstate Commerce Commission and from my personal observation of the operation of train control.

#### HISTORICAL

It has long been recognized that some form of protection should be provided to prevent railroad collisions. This subject has been a live issue since 1880, with ever-increasing interest, until in 1906 Congress passed an act directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate the subject of automatic train control, as a result of which the commission appointed a body known as the Block Signal and Train Control Board. Reports were made to the commission annually from 1908 to 1912, inclusive. Several hundred different automatic stop and train-control systems were inspected by the board, and annual reports were made to the Congress containing such details as the commission thought necessary.

The Block Signal and Train Control Board was superseded in the development of this subject by the Bureau of Safety in 1913, and beginning with 1914 reports were made by the Bureau of Safety covering tests and inspections of many additional devices.

On January 14, 1919, the United States Railway Administration created an automatic train control committee, which also inspected a number of devices, reporting from time to time to the director general.

Definite action was taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission on January 10, 1922, when under authority of section 26 of the transportation act the commission issued order No. 13413, under which 49 railroads were given an opportunity to show cause why an order should not be entered requiring the installation of automatic stop or automatic train-control devices upon designated portions of their lines. Hearings were held before the commission during March and April, 1922, as a result of which the railroads failed utterly to show cause why the order should not be enforced; whereupon, on June 13, 1922, the commission made its order permanent, under the terms of which 49 railroads, specified by name, were required to install on or before the 1st of January, 1925, an automatic stop or train-control device or devices applicable to or operated in connection with all road engines running on or over at least one full passenger-engine division.

In this order the commission set forth the general requirements covering the design and construction of such systems, and provided that each installation made pursuant to such order should when completed be subject to inspection by and approval of the commission. In issuing this order the commission made the following statement:

We do not desire to force any carrier to adopt a particular type which it believes is not entirely suitable to its peculiar needs if there are others available which within a reasonable time may be shown to be more suitable. In view, however, of the investigations which have already been made and the time which has elapsed we are of the opinion that a six months' period will give sufficient time for any road to decide upon the device it should select. Within this time, provided a sufficient installation is made and intensive tests of the device are conducted, it can be determined whether or not the device will be suitable.

As to what has been done to carry out the order of the commission, this will be referred to later.

On January 14, 1924, the commission issued a second order requiring the installation of 92 additional divisions, and specified that installation should be completed by February 1, 1926. This order included an additional division upon 47 of the carriers contained in the first order, and additional carriers as shown therein. Hearings were held before the commission May 7, to May 17, 1924, inclusive, and again the railroads were fully represented. It was shown conclusively that an automatic train-control system which fully complied with the requisites of the commission and which had received the approval of the commission was available.

During the time the commission has been investigating this subject, and in the period 1906 to 1921, as shown by the records of the commission, there were 106,473 train accidents, in which 6,142 persons were killed, 95,936 injured, and a property loss of \$80,386,694. Of rear-end collisions there were 17,043, in



which 1,914 persons were killed and 25,974 injured, with a property loss of \$21,507,894. Of head-on collisions there were 9,255, in which 2,412 persons were killed and 34,708 injured, with a property loss of \$19,461,769.

The latest figures available and which will give you the facts regarding conditions at the present time are found in the Interstate Commerce Commission's report for the month of October, 1924. This report shows that during the month of August, 1924, 95 employees of the railroads on duty were killed, and 2,567 were injured; 14 passengers were killed, and 779 were injured. For the eight months of this year ending with August the report shows that 788 employees on duty were killed, and 20,932 were injured; 101 passengers were killed, and 3,736 were injured.

The following is taken from the Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of December 1, 1924:

The record of accidents investigated by our forces for the year ended June 30, 1924, shows 100 collisions and derailments, in which 245 persons were killed and 1,501 injured. These accidents may be divided into four groups: (1) derailments; (2) collisions in automatic-signal territory; (3) collisions in nonautomatic-signal territory; and (4) collisions in time-table and train-order territory and yards. The following table shows the number of accidents in each group, the number in each group which probably would have been prevented if an adequate system of automatic train control had been in use, and the number of persons killed and injured in such preventable accidents:

Group	Accidents	Preventable accidents	Persons killed in preventable accidents	Persons injured in preventable accidents
Derailments.....	46	14	19	77
Collisions in automatic-signal territory.....	12	9	18	122
Collisions in nonautomatic-signal territory.....	10	8	18	134
Collisions in time-table and train-order territory and yards.....	32	19	58	447
Total.....	100	50	113	780

The number of preventable accidents represent 50 per cent, the number of persons killed represent 46 per cent, and the number injured in such preventable accidents represent 52 per cent of the total number of accidents investigated, persons killed, and persons injured.

The importance of continuous effort to prevent railway accidents, with their great loss of life, injury to persons, and destruction of property, can hardly be overstated.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
Washington, December 8, 1924.

Hon. H. P. SNYDER,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your letter of December 2, asking for certain data in connection with railroad accidents since May 24, 1924, was received in due course. I called upon our Bureau of Safety for the information you desire and understand that your office was advised by telephone that preparation of a list of all accidents since May 24, 1924, would require the tabulation of several thousand items. There are inclosed copies of our monthly statistical reports, which I understand will meet your present needs. These reports cover the period from May to August, both inclusive. Figures for subsequent months have not as yet been compiled. You will note that the number of accidents classed as "train accidents" are as follows:

May.....	1,761
June.....	1,654
July.....	1,722
August.....	1,906
Total.....	7,043

There is also inclosed a list of all accidents in which our Bureau of Safety made investigations and reports since May 24, 1924, which these reports state would not have occurred if an adequate system of automatic train control had been in use.

At the present time there are 12 accidents under investigation, 11 of which occurred since May 24. Of the 11, the result of the bureau's investigation as to the accident on the Baltimore & Ohio at Weverton, Md., on November 15, which resulted in the death of 1 and the injury of 8 persons, has led to the conclusion that it would have been prevented by automatic train control. Investigation of one accident has developed that it would not have been so prevented, and the investigation of the remaining nine has not been sufficiently completed to permit of expression of a conclusion thereon.

Very truly yours,

H. C. HALL, Chairman.

Accidents investigated by the Bureau of Safety since May 24, 1924, in the report covering which it was stated that the particular accident would not have occurred had an adequate system of automatic train control been in use

Date	Railroad	Location	Persons killed	Persons injured
June 19	Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis	Adairsville, Ga.....	3	20
24	Hocking Valley.....	Linworth, Ohio.....	1	1
July 10	Spokane, Portland & Seattle	Avon, Oreg.....	1	5
29	Piedmont & Northern	Charlotte, N. C.....	1	15
Aug. 15	Chesapeake & Ohio.....	Dayton, Ky.....	1	1
16	Texas & Pacific.....	Grand Prairie, Tex.....	1	1
30	New York Central.....	Syracuse, N. Y.....	0	43
Sept. 5	Missouri Pacific.....	Howcott, La.....	5	5
7	Louisville & Nashville	Frankfort, Ky.....	3	1
24	Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific	Des Moines, Iowa.....	1	1
Oct. 3	Southern Pacific.....	Noonan, Tex.....	2	2
3	Baltimore & Ohio.....	Aviston, Ill.....	1	16
13	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western	New Milford, Pa.....	3	17
19	International.....	Tonawanda, N. Y.....	4	98
19	Portland Electric.....	Naez, Oreg.....	0	6
Nov. 11	Lehigh Valley.....	Aldene, N. J.....	1	0
	16 accidents listed.....		28	232

Investigation has been completed of 27 other accidents which have occurred since May 24, 1924; in the reports covering these investigations no statement was made concerning automatic train control. These 27 accidents resulted in the death of 62 persons and the injury of 326 persons.

I wish to call the attention of Congress to the following editorials which have been recently published in the Washington Post:

[From Washington Post, Thursday, November 27, 1924]

#### FOR SAFETY IN TRAVEL

The time originally granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the installation of train-control appliances upon railroads will expire on January 1 next. Severe penalties are imposed by law upon such railroads as fail to comply with the commission's order. Some of the leading railroad companies are delinquent and will not be able to install the required apparatus by January 1. They are preparing an appeal for an extension of time.

There is no reasonable excuse for further delay or for an extension of time. The first order of the commission was issued nearly three years ago. The fact that some railroads complied with the order is proof that all could have done so if they had been so inclined. One reason after another was assigned for failure to obey the law, but the Interstate Commerce Commission appears to have reached the limit of its patient consideration of these excuses, and certainly the law and the public interest require that no further delays be granted.

Although some railroad companies assert that train control is in its experimental stage, the fact is well established that appliances are successfully in operation upon many roads. The prevention of accidents due to the fallible human element has been demonstrated. At the same time, on roads not equipped with train-control devices frightful accidents have occurred which would have been prevented by automatic appliances designed to stop trains in cases where the engineers ignore the usual warnings and plunge into collisions.

During the last two years many passengers have been killed because of the failure of railroads to install train-control devices. After January 1, in case of such accidents on railroads that have failed to comply with the law, it is probable that heavy damage suits could be sustained, thereby subjecting delinquent railroads to double penalties. The legal counsel of the railroads may conclude that the risks incurred by further evasion of law are more costly than the expense involved in installing safety devices. When that point is reached the railroads will doubtless install train-control devices without further pressure, but in the meantime human life may be needlessly lost.

The law commands the installation of train control. The Interstate Commerce Commission has gone beyond the limit of its authority in granting time for such installations. It is up to the railroad executives to comply with their plain duty. They need not expect to hold public sympathy in other directions if they persistently fail and refuse to provide the safety devices required by law.

[From the Washington Post, Monday, December 8, 1924]

#### NEEDLESS DANGER IN TRAVEL

Another rear-end collision occurred recently in which human life was lost and many persons injured. The "accident" occurred near Englewood Station, Chicago. It was preventable; and if the railroad had been equipped with train-control apparatus, the blunder of the train crew could not have resulted in a crash. A Pennsylvania passenger train from Cincinnati ran into the rear end of a special train from

Columbus. One person was killed and 25 injured, some of them seriously. Two cars of the special were crushed, and the engine of the Cincinnati train was derailed. The special train was picking up speed upon leaving the station and the regular train was slowing down when the collision occurred.

The law requires the railroads of the United States to equip themselves with train-control apparatus. Three years' notice has been given for the first installation, and the time limit will expire January 1 next. The railroads that have failed and refused to install equipment are asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant them further time, on one pretext or another.

The time has come for decisive action by the Government. There is no excuse for further delay. The railroads that have failed to install equipment are trifling with human life for the sake of saving money. It is an intolerable affront to the public, and a terrible calamity may occur at any time to stir the people to the danger to which they are unnecessarily subjected.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will not be doing its duty if it overlooks the public safety and interest and extends favors to the railroads that have flagrantly failed to obey the law. Let the law be applied!

Much has been said about the protection afforded by automatic block signals, yet the statistics of the commission show that between July, 1911, and March 31, 1924, there were 111 collisions caused by failure of the engineman to observe and be governed by signal indications, in which there were 510 persons killed and 2,458 injured, with a property loss—not including damage to lading—of \$1,539,074. Such human failures are not surprising, however, when one considers that the safety to trains, under present operating conditions, largely depends upon the engineman observing and being governed by a small signal light set at the top of a pole, often located at considerable distance away from the track and frequently obscured by fog, smoke, rain, or snow. All of these accidents and all of this tremendous loss of life and property occurred while the commission was investigating the subject of automatic train control.

The orders of the commission were undoubtedly based upon accurate information developed by thorough and long service inspections of automatic stop and automatic train-control devices then in operation, all of which were of the intermittent contact or ramp type, including the following:

(a) Miller automatic stop, in service since November 1, 1914, on 105.4 miles of double track—Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad, including 85 locomotives.

(b) American automatic stop, in service since June, 1919, on 21 miles of single track—Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, including 37 locomotives.

(c) The Regan automatic train-control system in service since March, 1920, on 22.4 miles of double track—Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway, including 20 locomotives.

As distinguished from the Miller and the American automatic stop systems, the Regan automatic train-control system is so arranged as to include speed control, such as to enforce prescribed limited speed when approaching danger, and an automatic stop or prescribed low-speed control when danger is immediately impending. With this system the engineman must be alert to continue even at low speed when a dangerous condition prevails—as a misplaced switch, broken rail, open drawbridge, train standing on siding fouling the main track, or a train immediately ahead.

In other words, while the other systems described permit a train to move at full speed in the face of danger, the Regan system stops the train unless the engineman is alert, when by pushing a button he is permitted to enter the block at low speed, while with the other systems he may release and then proceed at full speed.

Fully satisfied with the test installation of the Regan system, covering a period in excess of three years, the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway, in compliance with the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission, decided to install, and did install, the Regan system throughout its Illinois division, and in line with the order, submitted plans and specifications and promptly complied therewith, completing the installation of 165.4 miles of double main track from Blue Island to Rock Island, Ill., and 102 locomotives on November 1, 1923. This installation was inspected by the commission, such inspection being completed November 30, 1923, and approved by the commission on December 17, 1923.

It will be noted that the Rock Island complied with the order of the commission and completed its installation of the Regan system one year before the time limit set by the order. Further, the Regan automatic train-control system was ap-

proved by the commission as in full compliance with the requisites laid down by that body.

This installation was completed at a total cost of \$235,789, including all expense of installation.

#### INTERCHANGEABILITY

The question of interchangeability has been set forth as one of the difficulties preventing such carriers from complying with the order of the commission. What are the facts as to this? The records show that the New York Central lines are testing three different types of automatic train control, none of which is interchangeable with the others.

The Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville, the Chicago & Eastern Illinois, and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, using the same terminal at Chicago, are testing three different types of train control, none of which is interchangeable.

Reference to the tabulation of carriers, which is made a part of this record, will show the position of the carriers as to the adoption of automatic train-control appliances and the inconsistency between the demand for interchangeability and the devices now under test.

If interchangeability is to be secured, such that trains using joint tracks or detour will operate successfully with automatic train control, surely the best solution of the problem lies in the railroads of the same operating group adopting the same automatic train-control system. The train-control system adopted by the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway is the only train-control system in service which was installed in line with the order of the commission and which has been approved by the commission. As such, it has set the standard with which other railroads in its territory should comply.

#### FUEL ECONOMY—SAVING IN OPERATION

In addition to the conservation of life and property, experience has shown tremendous savings in operation due to this scientific improvement in railroad service, as under a train-control system not alone is safe operation insured but, substituting the principle of "spacing trains by restricting their speed" rather than by stopping them, as is done under the present antiquated method of railroading, train control becomes an asset and a distinct earning power. Whereas the American Railway Association rules provide that a train shall stop at automatic block signals in the "stop" position, and then proceed under a certain speed prescribed by rule alone, the Regan automatic train-control system, as heretofore stated, compels the train to reduce speed and compels the engineman to indicate his alertness to the situation by acknowledging the "stop" signal and permits the train to proceed under safe speed without stopping. Such is the practice and the rule on the Illinois division of the Rock Island, where a check of the operation during the month of July, 1924, showed that in the movement of 1,105 freight trains and 1,183 passenger trains there were a total of 6,078 freight-train stops and 485 passenger-train stops eliminated, which, capitalized at the American Railway Association figure of \$1.92 per stop, would amount to the tremendous figure of \$150,000 per annum in the saving of fuel, wear and tear on equipment, and loss of time.

To stop a heavy-tonnage train unnecessarily costs money; to install a proper system of train control increases track capacity and saves money.

Mr. Aishton, president of the American Railway Association, is authority for the statement that if 1 pound of coal were saved per 1,000 gross-ton miles, it would mean a saving of \$3,165,000 per annum. To stop a heavy-tonnage freight train unnecessarily consumes an average of approximately 665 pounds of coal, so that when safety can be secured with economy in such measure as the figures above indicate with the installation of automatic train control there is evidently no good reason why further delay should be permitted if the reason for delay is based on the cost of installation.

#### RAILROADS—AND COMPLIANCE WITH ORDER NO. 13413

The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway has complied with the order of the commission, and the Regan automatic train-control system has been approved. At this moment no other train-control system has been approved. It is evident that other railroads have made no serious attempt to carry out the order of the commission. Numerous experiments and tests are being made on short sections of track, evidently with the hope that there will be an extension of time granted and that installations over additional mileage which may be ordered by the commission will be postponed and probably abandoned. The railroads have already succeeded in securing modification of the second order of the commission covering a large number of railroads which were scheduled for completion by January 1, 1926; but order of June 13, 1922, as it applies to



the carriers listed herein, and which were ordered to have their installations completed on a full passenger engine division by January 1, 1925, was not modified or extended.

Automatic train control should be installed without further delay. The attempt of the railroad companies to cloud the issue should be discouraged, considering that an approved automatic train-control system is available and that the manufacturers of this device are conscientiously striving to secure installations; that they have the ability to make good; that they have successfully met all tests laid down by the commission or by any railroad. Considering further that an automatic train-control system is operating successfully and to the entire satisfaction of the officials and the men on the railroad upon which it is installed there should be no further delay in its adoption.

The officers are outspoken in their commendation of the device, and the locomotive engineers of the division on which it is installed are enthusiastically in favor of it. There is no greater obligation resting upon the railroads, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Congress than that of security and safety for the traveling public, for there is no condition in life where a competent and valuable citizen is so helpless to protect himself from bodily injury or death as when riding as a passenger on a railroad.

As to what has been done by the railroads over the many years the commission has been investigating this subject, a study shows that no installations were made on any railroad except upon the initiative and at the sole expense of inventors and manufacturers. Even on the Rock Island Railroad the preliminary installation was made entirely at the expense of the Regan Co., and it was not until the system had qualified in service for a period covering three years that authority was given by the board of directors to equip a full operating division.

In spite of the fact that an approved automatic train-control system is available that complies with all of the requisites covering design and construction as laid down by the commission, that it is in daily service on one of the great trunk-line railways, under all conditions of traffic, performing to the full satisfaction of the officials of the railroad, an installation comprising 330 miles of track and 102 locomotives; in spite of the fact that all witnesses from that railroad testifying before the Interstate Commerce Commission, including the vice president in charge of operation, locomotive engineers, and others, fully indorsed the device; in spite of the fact that locomotive engineers of the division on which it is installed have by resolution unanimously indorsed the device and recommended its extension; regardless of the fact that this train-control system qualified under the period of test outlined by the commission and that the manufacturers are prepared to install it on any railroad, the railroads of this country have by a studied campaign of camouflage and in violation of the principles that should actuate these common carriers set out to defeat the will of Congress and the orders of the commission.

What is the reason for the delay? The device approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as heretofore stated, has fully qualified. I understand that a supply of the apparatus is available. It has demonstrated that tremendous savings in operation may be secured on lines of dense traffic, and this information is all in the hands of the railroad companies. The subject of train control has been taken out from the realm of theory and is now an actual accomplishment.

What is the reason for failure of the carriers to install this device?

Let us analyze the situation by reference to the carriers covered by the order, which shows the following:

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Complete division. Nonapproved device.

Atlantic Coast Line: Short-track section General Railway Signal Co.'s intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Baltimore & Ohio Railroad: No installation.

Boston & Albany (New York Central): Some experiments made. No installation.

Boston & Maine: No installation.

Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh: Small test installation. General Railway Signal Co.'s induction system. Disapproved by the commission. No further installation.

Central Railroad of New Jersey: No installation.

Chesapeake & Ohio: American intermittent ramp type; 61 miles single track and 64 locomotives equipped. This system has no speed control. Nonapproved device.

Chicago & Alton: Experimenting with Bostwick induction 20 miles roadway, 16 locomotives, vicinity of Bloomington, Ill. Nonapproved device.

Chicago & Eastern Illinois: Miller intermittent ramp type, installed in 1914; 105.4 miles double track, 65 locomotives. Nonapproved device.

Chicago & Erie: No installation.

Chicago & North Western: No installation.

Chicago, Burlington & Quincy: Twenty-mile Sprague intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville: 20-mile roadside

Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville: Twenty-mile roadside, six locomotives, Sprague intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. River division. Nonapproved device.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific: Regan automatic train-control system, intermittent ramp type, 165 miles double track, 102 locomotives equipped. Approved device.

Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha: This carrier has been relieved by the commission from compliance with the order, although a line of comparatively dense traffic.

Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific: Thirty-five and two-tenths miles General Railway Signal Co.'s intermittent induction, with several locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis (New York Central): Twenty-mile roadside, six locomotive equipments. General Railway Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

Delaware & Hudson: Four miles Federal Signal Co.'s continuous induction, 1923. Nonapproved device. No further attempt at installation.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western: Twenty miles Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction, 10 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Erie Railroad: No installation.

Galveston, Harrisburg & San Antonio (Southern Pacific): Fifty-one miles Bostwick induction system. Nonapproved device.

Great Northern: Twenty miles Sprague intermittent induction, with seven engine equipments. Nonapproved device.

Illinois Central: Twenty miles Union Switch & Signal Co.'s modified continuous induction, with 10 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Kansas City Southern: No installation.

Lehigh Valley: Short track section, General Railway Signal Co.'s intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Long Island (Pennsylvania Railroad): No installation.

Louisville & Nashville: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

Michigan Central (New York Central): Twenty miles, General Railway Signal Co.'s continuous induction and several locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Missouri Pacific: Twenty-five miles, Bostwick intermittent induction; 29 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

New York Central: Twenty miles, Sprague intermittent induction; 15 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

New York, Chicago & St. Louis: Experimenting with small installation Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

New York, New Haven & Hartford: Experimenting with small installation Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

Norfolk & Western: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction, complete division. Nonapproved device.

Northern Pacific: Twenty miles, Sprague intermittent induction with seven locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Co.: Union Switch & Signal Co., continuous induction. Complete division. Nonapproved device.

Pennsylvania Railroad: No compliance with order as to installation on designated division. Test installation on Lewiston branch, completed 1923. Nonapproved device.

Pere Marquette: No installation.

Philadelphia & Reading: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction; complete division. Nonapproved device.

Pittsburgh & Lake Erie (New York Central): Twenty miles, Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction; 10 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis: No installation.

Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s continuous induction, 25 miles; 16 locomotive equipments. Nonapproved device.

St. Louis-San Francisco Railway: Twenty miles, Bostwick intermittent induction; 22 locomotives. Nonapproved device.

Southern Pacific: Bostwick intermittent induction. Nonapproved device.

Southern Railway: No installation.

Union Pacific: Union Switch & Signal Co.'s modified continuous induction. Nonapproved device.

West Jersey & Seashore (Pennsylvania Railroad): No installation.

Western Maryland: Relieved from order of commission.

It will be noted that none of the carriers covered by the order of the commission, other than the Rock Island, have adopted the only automatic train-control system that has been approved, and that some are installing systems that have been inspected and not approved; others are making or figuring upon small installations that have not been approved; while still others have made no evident move in the selection of a device.

It is worthy of note that carriers which are proceeding with expensive installations costing approximately \$10,000 per mile (for nonapproved devices) are among those carriers earning in excess of 6 per cent on valuation or have tremendous surpluses, in the face of the fact that the approved system can be installed at approximately \$2,000 per mile of double track, including both locomotive and roadside equipment complete.

The action of the common carriers subject to the transportation act when automatic train control is considered is deplorable. Their position has been one of consistent objection, one of constant obstruction to the consummation of the act of Congress and the orders of the commission. It is probable that they recognize the fact that the orders of the commission now confronting them cover but a small proportion of the total passenger mileage and that their tactics are based upon a desire to prevent the issuance of further orders or bring about a modification of those now in effect.

No matter what the motive may be, it is safe to say that from the viewpoint of the traveling public, which to a very large extent includes the holders of railway securities, this great improvement is here to stay, and that within a few years it will be a source of wonder how railroad trains were operated at such extremely high speeds as are now in vogue without such protection. Surely when safety, efficiency, and economy are considered, automatic train control as demonstrated in daily service on the Rock Island, stands out as one of the great engineering achievements—the utilization of the resources of nature for the benefit of mankind—and represents an immense stride toward conservation in the saving of fuel, wear and tear on equipment, and in the increased safety which it insures to the traveling public.

The responsibilities resting upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce its train-control orders are clearly defined by law. In so far as the railroads are concerned, they should be compelled to comply with the law and with the orders of the commission. Surely public safety is a matter in which partisanship can not be shown.

In opposing the order of the commission the representatives of the carriers have contended that no automatic train-control device is sufficiently developed as to warrant installation, and that such devices are in the development or experimental stages. In all fairness to the railroads who have taken this position, the statement may be made truthfully that automatic train control is advanced to a far greater degree of perfection than was the automatic signal, automatic coupler, or automatic air brake when those great improvements were adopted. Nothing could be more perfect in its operation, as demonstrated under actual service conditions, than the automatic train-control system that has been approved by the commission. Duplicating the conditions which resulted in such terrible wrecks as occurred at Porter, Ind., the Twentieth Century wreck at Forsyth, N. Y., and many others, this train-control system has demonstrated its perfection in the prevention of such accidents when for any reason the human agency fails.

In view of the facts, and the investigations and inspections by experts of the commission, it is evident that the railroads have not moved in the direction of compliance with the order of the commission with a view of finding a suitable automatic train-control system for installation; and when it is considered that the first order covers but 10,000 miles of track of a total passenger mileage in excess of 250,000 miles, or 5 per cent of the total—that but approximately 5,000 locomotives of a total of 60,000, or about 8 per cent of the total, distributed among 49 carriers—there should be prompt steps taken to enforce the order of the commission by making the penalty such as will insure prompt action.

The Congress, in section 26 of the Interstate Commerce Commission act, authorized the commission "after investigation to prescribe the installation of automatic train stops or train-control devices, or other safety devices upon the whole or any part of the railroad or any carrier by railroad subject to the act."

The commission has investigated and inspected through its experts many hundreds of inventions and systems covering a

period in excess of 18 years, and for the past three years has concentrated its attention upon investigations, inspections, and analyses of actual installations. As a result, the commission has approved the automatic train-control system which was installed by a great trunk-line railway in conformity with the order of the commission, as in full compliance with the requisites of the commission.

The time limit as set by the commission for compliance with its order for the installation of such systems, namely, January 1, 1925, is about to expire. The penalty for noncompliance is evidently inadequate to produce the desired action. Prompt and strenuous measures should be taken by the Congress and such a penalty imposed as will cause the carriers to comply with the order of the commission without further delay.

Here is the language used by Commissioner Esch, and which is concurred in by Commissioners McChord and Cox, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, with regard to the necessity of adopting train control. You will find this language on page 448, Interstate Commerce Commission Report No. 13413. He says:

With the exception of three roads that have installed devices of the ramp type the carriers generally have definitely stated to us that they will not install this latter type. Thus they discard the successful results of years of effort to develop a practicable automatic train-control device, which upon final test we have found meets all our requirements. In view of the expressed attitude of the carriers, the commission's decision and conclusions appear to have but little weight. In view also of this decision of the carriers—if they are to be permitted to adhere to it—any further expenditure of either time or money experimenting with this type of device would simply be wasted, notwithstanding the fact that it has been found by us to meet every requirement and that we have approved its installation. This would be true even though a joint committee should supervise such experimentation.

On page 449 of the same report they make this further statement:

In its original report in this case, June 13, 1922, this commission gave the history of what has been done by Congress and the commission with respect to automatic train control. Congress and this commission have been at work for more than 18 years in an endeavor to persuade and require the carriers to install automatic train control, with scant results.

And on page 450 of the same report they use this language:

We had concluded prior to our first report (1) that the need for automatic train-control devices had been clearly shown, and (2) that devices had been developed and used under actual service conditions that met this need in a practical manner. These conclusions were and still are the bases for our orders in this case. They are the results of over 15 years of study culminating in many months of tests and observations under actual service conditions. The facts are too well known to need further discussion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the face of all these facts, can it be said that the railroads of this country are going to be allowed to go on ignoring the orders of the Congress and the Interstate Commerce Commission? And shall the Congress and the people of this country sit calmly by and allow people to be injured and killed almost daily, as has been pointed out in the remarks I have made, when an improved device can be installed on these roads at a reasonable cost, which would not only save thousands of people from becoming injured, but would save hundreds of lives and would be a saving on the upkeep and operation of the railroads to the extent that the interest on the cost of installation would be more than saved?

Section 26 of the interstate commerce act provides that the railroads shall be fined \$100 per day for noncompliance with the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and this penalty has brought no results, thereby furnishing the necessity for the enactment of my bill, H. R. 9773, which provides as follows:

That section 26 of the interstate commerce act as amended is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 26. That the commission may, after investigation, order any carrier by railroad subject to this act, within a time specified in the order, to install automatic train-stop or train-control devices, or other safety devices, which comply with specifications and requirements prescribed by the commission, upon the whole or any part of its railroad, such order to be issued and published at least two years before the date specified for its fulfillment: *Provided*, That a carrier shall not be held to be negligent because of its failure to install such devices upon a portion of its railroad not included in the order; and any action arising because of an accident happening upon such portion of its railroad shall be deter-



mined without consideration of the use of such devices upon another portion of its railroad. Any common carrier which refuses or neglects to comply with any order of the commission made under the authority conferred by this section shall be liable to a penalty of \$1,000 for each day that such refusal or neglect continues, which shall accrue to the United States, and may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States. Every director, officer, or employee of a common carrier, or other person, in whom, at any time within the period for compliance with an order of the commission made in respect of such carrier under the authority of this section, there is vested, by appropriate action of the board of directors or the president of the carrier, the duty to cause compliance with such order (or if such action has not been taken, then every president and director of the carrier during such period), shall, if (1) an accident involving bodily injury or loss of human life occurs upon the railroad of such carrier, and (2) such accident is attributable in whole or in part to any failure to comply with the order of the commission, and (3) such director, officer, employee, or other person willfully or negligently failed to cause such compliance, on conviction of such offense in a court of competent jurisdiction, be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000 or be imprisoned for not more than five years. As used in this section, the term 'board of directors' includes any other board, committee, or agency or any person in whom are vested the powers commonly vested in a board of directors of a common carrier, and the term 'president' includes any other chief executive in whom is vested the powers commonly vested in a president of a common carrier."

This measure warrants the prompt attention of this Congress.

#### MONUMENT TO "NUNS OF THE BATTLE FIELD"

MR. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing a speech delivered by former Congressman Kennedy.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting in the Record a speech delivered by ex-Congressman Kennedy. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MR. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me to extend my remarks in the Record I include an address delivered at the ceremonies attending the unveiling of the monument to the "Nuns of the Battle Field," in Washington, D. C., Saturday afternoon, September 20, 1924, by Hon. Ambrose Kennedy, of Woonsocket, R. I., a former Member of Congress, who for 10 years represented in this House the third district of Rhode Island, as follows:

The leading events of the Civil War have been often repeated in the years that have since come and gone, and in every section of the country are observable numerous tablets and memorials dedicated to the deeds of chivalry and heroism that signalized that memorable struggle. The eye is always gladdened at the sight of impressive shaft and pillar proclaiming in silence the gratitude of a people to the national heroes whose genius preserved the Nation and whose lives sum up a large part of its history. Their names and fame have been and always will be held in reverent remembrance by true and loyal Americans everywhere.

In the annals of that war there is one glorious chapter that has too long remained uncelebrated, but, due to the generosity and patriotism of the women of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, we are commemorating it on this spot to-day. Here, on public ground, a new and imposing monument stands revealed. Not to the heroes but rather to the heroines of the Civil War is this splendid memorial dedicated. The advancing generations of Americans as they pass this way in the years to come and view this fine creation in bronze and granite will realize then, if they never did before, that hard by the far-flung battle lines, where shot and shell carried their terrible message of death and destruction in the war of '61, there were heroines in the garb of the Catholic sisterhoods, who, amidst these hideous surroundings, were ever ready to relieve the anguish and strengthen the hopes of the suffering and dying soldiers.

Up to 10 years ago, when the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians began to prepare the way for the erection of this memorial, very little had been heard of the services of these war-nursing sisters. Yet their devoted and patriotic ministrations shed glory upon the many thrilling occurrences of the Civil War. They were the special almoners of mercy amidst the ghastliest horrors then known to human warfare. Though suddenly and unexpectedly called into service, they were not unprepared for the trials that confronted them amidst the heartrending and revolting scenes of this crowded theater of action. If they were lacking in material equipment, by their faith and charity they were admirably prepared. These virtues they had long before pledged to the service of God and humanity. The privations incident to the havoc and confusion of war did not in the least dishearten them, for their usual practice of self-sacrifice and

self-denial enabled them to overlook the things that affected their own personal comfort and devote their attention solely to the relief and assistance of the wounded and dying. Many of these sisters came from old and famous institutions of learning in different parts of the country; many others from orphan asylums and well-established hospitals where they had hitherto presided, to answer the official call for nurses and take up the harder tasks and duties which the horrors of war entailed. Many of them, too, belonged to orders whose victories for charity constituted a bright page in the history of antecedent wars, both in Europe and America.

Hundreds of sisters, representative of 12 different orders, took active part in the service, the details of which volumes alone could unfold. The number comprised Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, Sisters of the Mother Seton Order of Charity, Sisters of Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Sisters of Our Lady of Mercy, Sisters of Providence of St. Mary of the Woods, Sisters of St. Dominic, and the Ursuline Sisters. All these furnished their respective quotas to labor in the humane and merciful work. And they did service in 18 States and in the District of Columbia, laboring in military hospitals and going from one battle field to another in ambulances, in old wagons, and in every form of vehicle that could be made available, where thousands of suffering and dying soldiers in the Blue and in the Gray were the objects of their tender ministrations. Not only did they nurse the patients, but in gentle whispers they spoke the words of consolation that lightened the burdens which oppressed the hearts of these soldiers.

In administering to the comfort of these unfortunates, these sisters exhibited a wonderful spirit of fortitude and charity, and they showed no preference whatever in the application of their labors. Their services were impartially rendered on Union and Confederate sides. When their labors were concluded, without pomp or parade, but with the calm and quiet that characterized their coming, softly and silently they returned to their pre-war occupations, and from that day to this no historian has ever recorded their names and no Congress until the Sixty-fifth had ever paid them a tribute of recognition. That Congress granted to the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians the privilege of erecting a memorial to the war-nursing sisters; and they have nobly erected it here. All honor to the public spirit and patriotism of that organization! It has called back almost from oblivion the story of those dark-robed messengers of mercy who, at the call of President Lincoln, voluntarily left the peaceful atmosphere of their accustomed surroundings to serve amidst the noxious vapors of military camp and hospital in the awful hour of misery and affliction.

The services rendered by these various sisters stand forth conspicuously, evincing a splendid heroism among the many and varied scenes of that war; and, to their honor, be it said, they never sought nor received any tangible rewards for their labors. I venture to say that, if they were living to-day, they would in their humility lay but little, if any, claim even to the recognition which this belated monument indicates. Well did they know that the works of mercy they so tenderly performed transcend the measure of reward which earthly wealth or recognition can bestow.

Many a tribute has been paid them by Union and Confederate soldiers, but none more touching or expressive than that of an eyewitness to their labors which appears in the Recollections of Abraham Lincoln.

"Of all the forms of charity and benevolence seen in the crowded wards of the hospitals, those of some Catholic sisters were among the most efficient. I never knew whence they came or what was the name of their order. More lovely than anything I have ever seen in art, so long devoted to illustrations of love, mercy, and charity, are the pictures that remain of these modest sisters going on their errands of mercy among the suffering and the dying. Gentle and womanly, yet with the courage of soldiers leading a forlorn hope, to sustain them in contact with such horrors. As they went from cot to cot, distributing the medicines prescribed, or administering the cooling, strengthening draughts as directed, they were veritable angels of mercy. Their words were suited to every sufferer. One they incited and encouraged, another they calmed and soothed. With every soldier they conversed about his home, his wife, his children, all the loved ones he was soon to see again if he was obedient and patient. How many times have I seen them exorcise pain by their presence or their words! How often has the hot forehead of the soldier grown cool as one of these sisters bathed it! How often has he been refreshed, encouraged, and assisted along the road to convalescence, when he would otherwise have fallen by the way, by the home memories with which these unpaid nurses filled his heart!"

In the hospital and military reports of the Civil War may be found here and there records of the enlistments of many of these war-nursing sisters. Some of the institutions, also, from which they went out to answer the call to service still retain the original registers of their names. From these and other sources have been carefully collated and placed in the records of Congress of the 18th of March, 1918, a long and authentic roll of their names, both family and re-

higious. But this record is by no means complete. Lapse of years has made a complete record impossible. Many of these names were assembled by a distinguished member of your order, Mrs. Ellen Ryan Jolly, who gave years of painstaking study and research to this subject and who resolved long ago that one day the name and fame of these sisters would be fittingly and publicly honored.

That happy day has arrived, and her labor of love is accomplished. Here on this piece of ground in the Nation's Capital she sees her fondest hope realized in the erection of this beautiful memorial. It is her work from its origin to its consummation. Long may it stand a testimonial to her fidelity to the righteous purpose it represents! Long may it remain to preserve and perpetuate the memory of the "Nuns of the Battle Field," whose labors for God and humanity in the trying days of the Civil War were an inspiring example of the doctrine of faith we cherish that in the performance of loyal Christian service in this life lies the surest way to eternal happiness in the life to come!

SAMUEL GOMPERS

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWES. Mr. Speaker, my request for unanimous consent for an extension of remarks in the RECORD regarding Samuel Gompers was occasioned by many years of pleasant friendship, and, in addition, I have the conviction that he was not only a remarkable man but a great American; that he remained steadfast to the broader principles of orderly government, and that his Americanism was acquired by study, reflection, and experience. It did not come to him through birth, environment, or heredity; it was an intellectual acquisition.

I have disagreed with him on many matters, but in the matter of American patriotism he was splendid.

He had brilliant wit of a sympathetic kind which did not hurt.

More men called him by his first name than any other man that ever lived, and he had the remarkable faculty of remembering names, and the first name or a nickname were the handles he usually applied.

There was a perpetual conflict going on within his great brain, developed by study, experience, and contact with men, and his big heart, which was always interested in the sentimental—in music, art, and good fellowship.

Children liked him. He was fond of animals. He had courage of a high order. He could say "no" upon occasion when to do so invited defeat.

To retain for nearly half a century leadership over the diversified interests—sometimes impatient demands—of the organized labor movement in this country presents a record unparalleled in the labor history of the world.

No wonder that upon his death the press of the country unite in speaking well of him! Great chiefs of industry, with whom he clashed and fought, respect his memory, and I feel sure he will be hard to replace.

He had that vast experience which is the best teacher, and his successor, no matter how able or well informed, can not come prepared, because no man now living has such a long record of the things that have gone before. Few men have the retentive memory possessed by him. His experience and memory were two strong elements of his great power.

I met him frequently under very trying circumstances. On one occasion, during the peace conference in Paris, accompanied by a delegation of representatives of American labor, just at a period when America's participation in the great World War had astounded Europe, every device of cajolery and appeal was pressed upon him to lead the American delegates to the international conference of labor leaders to be held at Berne, Switzerland.

I was present in Paris at the time, and in conversation with "Sam" when he was approached by American correspondents with an inquiry as to whether the American representatives of labor would attend the international convention of radicals to be held in Berne his answer was emphatic and in picturesque form. He stated the Americans would not go or become a party to such convention, as it did not represent the thought of American labor. I was impressed with his emphasis and his clear way of repudiating any connection or sympathy with the Bolshevik movement.

He fought to the utmost for labor, but his contentions for betterment were made under orderly and accepted legal methods.

He understood our theory of government, and any proposals from him were to be employed by legal enactments; and even in proposing changes they were rarely, if ever, of a revolutionary character.

He led American labor in supporting President Wilson during the war.

My feeling of personal friendship for this man was based upon many pleasant conversations on subjects which did not relate to labor problems, but on one occasion, upon being called upon to deliver an address upon the subject of labor, I reviewed some of his statements and speeches. Among many I found the following, showing vision, breadth, and statesmanship:

I do not know that I am entitled to very great credit because I am not a Bolshevik. With my understanding of American institutions and American opportunities, I repeat that the man who would not be a patriot in defense of the institutions of our country would be undeserving of the privilege of living in this country.

Again he said:

I stand in so far as I can and dare—and I dare much—for the principles of natural and national development and growth.

I am opposed, as is organized labor of America, to any destructive policy.

There is nothing that is worth while maintaining that I would aid or abet in destroying.

Our policy, our work, our method, our ideas, and our ideals, are to build, to construct, to grow, to help in the development of the highest and best in the human family; to make to-day a better day than yesterday, to make to-morrow a better day than to-day, to make to-morrow and to-morrow's to-morrow each a better day than the one that has gone before. That evolutionary process of progress and improvement is the basis for the opportunity for freedom, justice, and democracy.

He believed that American organized labor occupied a middle place in between extreme capitalistic selfishness and the I. W. W. and kindred movements of what he termed "irresponsibles" or "irreconcilables."

It is a question of dealing with such a movement as represented by the American trade-unions—the American Federation of Labor—or dealing with a body of irresponsibles or irreconcilables. If we are not on the right track, then those who represent the wildest orgy of destruction with no consideration for the rights of individuals will come to the front. It is a matter of choice between dealing with such elements or dealing with the constructive forces of the organized-labor movement of our country.

We find a touch of Jefferson and a thought from Wilson in this statement:

Freedom is not a condition, nor is democracy a condition. Freedom is the exercise, the functioning of freedom, the practice of freedom, the practice of democracy. All that society can give, all that government can give, is the opportunity for freedom. It depends upon the people to be intelligent and grow into the feeling, the exercise, and practice of the function of freedom. It was because the principles of freedom and democracy were menaced by the system of autocracy and militarism that the people of our country and the peoples of other countries and of the democracies of the world rallied around their banners and declared and made good their willingness to make the supreme sacrifice for the principles, the institutions, and the practice of freedom which were threatened to be overwhelmed and crushed.

He never permitted fine-spun theories and impracticable political panaceas to control his movements or change his convictions, as illustrated in this statement:

The field is littered with the whitened bones of those who have gone seeking salvation through laws. This the American labor movement has recognized, and there is no immediate danger that this philosophy will be deserted in favor of whims and caprices of similar portent. In the realm of political life there is always present the great personal necessity for remaining in political life. In the realm of industry there is only the necessity of going forward with the tasks and battles of industrial life, out of which we can not emerge even if we should wish to. The facts are inescapable, the battles must be fought where they are. Industry is real, as real as tools, and iron, and coal, and wheat. Men can lay their hands to the things of industry and get the feel of them. There is definiteness in industry, a great, all-enveloping, all-enfolding definiteness that comes as natural to mankind as life itself, because he goes through life by the feel of these things of industry.

There is nothing fixed and definite in the realm of abstraction, in the realm of politics. It lends itself to a false understanding of things that are real. When men depart from the fundamental productive process of the life of the world there is no power on earth



that can guarantee the accuracy of the course they still pursue. Look back upon the record of falsity made by these movements of abstraction in the war. Against such error the American labor movement in its loyalty to the cause of mankind sets its face and must continue to set its face.

He had but four years in school but became a great writer and speaker of unusual attainment. He was without affectation and hit from the shoulder.

To-day thoughtful American people in high places and in low are honoring the memory of Samuel Gompers, and the Russian people, as reported by the newspapers, are driving Trotsky from his rule.

The American Jew, Samuel Gompers, fought the Russian Jew, Trotsky, and, more than any other man, stopped the spread of Bolshevism in this country.

He opposed sabotage and communism and defeated it by upholding trade-unionism.

He knew that our forefathers, in their declarations of equality, did not mean that all men were created equal mentally, morally, and physically, but that all men had the equal right to the law's protection and equal rights to the world's opportunities for life and happiness.

He did not understand that liberty was license, and he knew that a democracy which degenerates may quickly turn to lawlessness, and after a brief period of misrule would become the prey of some strong man. This was the history of nations, which he had read and understood.

He knew that democracy was ordered liberty, which should respect and safeguard the rights of all.

There were many discouragements for him because of the impatience which would proceed with more speed than safety.

He knew better than most men that conditions are improved by steadily gaining point upon point and not by pulling down good and bad together in one hasty action.

He never had the dream that government could make everyone rich but believed it should give an equal opportunity to become rich.

He believed in preserving the real things which are worth while and to bring about by persuasion changes which were desired through the ballot and the suffrage in the old-fashioned way.

He knew that without law property, life, order, and happiness are impossible.

His method was to educate the voice of the majority.

Experience and history had taught there could be but one basis of settlement—an American one—made under the law, and there can be but one flag—the American flag.

The American people will watch with interest the naming of his successor. Will he understand our institutions as Mr. Gompers did?

Will he have his sagacity, his diplomacy, his broad sympathy, and, above all, his patience?

If his successor adopts the thoughts of Mr. Gompers as a guide, then truly his last words will be an inspiration for the man who follows him. Turning to his nurse, the great American labor chief said, in his parting breath:

This is the end. God bless our American institutions. May they grow better day by day.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. CHOLL (at the request of Mr. CUMMINGS) was granted leave of absence for five days on account of death in his family.

#### BILLS LAID ON THE TABLE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, two measures, House Joint Resolution 181 and the bill H. R. 7887, will be laid on the table, similar bills having become laws.

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAGEE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, December 12, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3842. A bill to provide for terms of the United States circuit and dis-

trict courts at Denton, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. J. Res. 240. A joint resolution confirming the execution of an agreement to settle the boundary line between the States of New York and Connecticut, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1039). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5083. A bill to create an additional judge in the district of Maryland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1037). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UNDERHILL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 9435. A bill to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Res. 365. A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information regarding Robert J. Owens, a prohibition agent; adverse (Rept. No. 1040). Laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 10644) to provide for a site and public building at Winter Haven, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: A bill (H. R. 10645) granting consent of Congress to the Valley Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande near Hidalgo, Tex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 10646) for the relief of the State of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 10647) extending time for the completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River between the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 10648) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River between the municipalities of Ambridge and Woodlawn, Beaver County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10649) to permit certain national associations to operate booths in public buildings containing post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 10650) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Lithuania to the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10651) to authorize the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Poland to the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPROUL of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10652) to permit certain national associations to furnish post offices with cancellation dies; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LA GUARDIA: Resolution (H. Res. 378) to determine the number of immigrants who have entered the United States from the Republic of Mexico from July 1, 1924, to December 1, 1924, their destination and occupation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10653) granting an increase of pension to Sallie A. Palmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10654) granting an increase of pension to Elizabetha Oswald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 10655) granting a pension to James B. Bentley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10656) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Crist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10657) for the relief of the Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10658) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREDERICKS: A bill (H. R. 10659) granting a pension to Sarah A. Stubblefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10660) granting a pension to Robert W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10661) granting a pension to Frederick M. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10662) granting a pension to Melissa J. Ramsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10663) granting an increase of pension to Jesse A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10664) granting a pension to William Bleckwendt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 10665) granting an increase of pension to Ellen M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 10666) granting an increase of pension to Jane O. Stinnett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 10667) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10668) granting a pension to Robert Zink; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 10669) granting an increase of pension to Oscar S. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS: A bill (H. R. 10670) for the relief of Frederick S. Easter; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 10671) granting an increase of pension to Mattie L. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 10672) for the relief of the Guamoco Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10673) for the relief of Alice P. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10674) granting a pension to Ophelia C. McKnight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 10675) granting a pension to Leo Pope Ott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOLFF: A bill (H. R. 10676) granting a pension to Henrietta Rowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 10677) granting an increase of pension to Phebe A. Rice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 10678) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Bush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3151. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Thomas Brennan Post, No. 380, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, urging repeal of the law authorizing the Director of the Mint to issue memorial 50-cent pieces, the profits from the sale of these coins to be turned over to the Stone Mountain Memorial Association of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3152. Also (by request), petition of Courtland Sanders Post, No. 21, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, favoring repeal of legislation which authorizes the Director of the Mint to issue memorial 50-cent pieces, the profits from the sale of these coins to be turned over to the Stone Mountain Memorial Association of Atlanta, Ga.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

3153. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., opposing the enactment into law of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3154. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Kearsarge Association of Naval Veterans, Boston, Mass., recommending construction

of a cruiser for the United States Navy to be named the *Kearsarge*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3155. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition of citizens of Oxford, Wis., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 3218, compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3156. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the secretary of the Central Union Label Council, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Jones bill, for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sundays; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3157. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of 73 citizens of Campbell County, Ky., against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) or the passage of any other religious legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3158. By Mr. WEFALD: Petition of 74 Chippewa Indians of Deer River, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3159. Also, petition of 28 Chippewa Indians of Rochert, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3160. Also, petition of 57 Chippewa Indians of Beaulieu, Minn., praying for a \$100 per capita payment from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3161. Also, petition of 53 Chippewa Indians of Pine Bend, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3162. Also, petition of 16 Chippewa Indians of Ebro, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3163. Also, petition of 89 Chippewa Indians of Cass Lake, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3164. Also, petition of 43 Chippewa Indians of Naytauwaush, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3165. Also, petition of 136 Chippewa Indians of Mahnomen, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3166. Also, petition of 26 Chippewa Indians of International Falls, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3167. Also, petition of 52 Chippewa Indians of Rice Lake District, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3168. Also, petition of 62 Chippewa Indians of Fosston, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3169. Also, petition of 32 Chippewa Indians of Lengby, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3170. Also, petition of 39 Chippewa Indians of Rogalskis Mill, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 from their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3171. Also, petition of 55 Chippewa Indians of Detroit, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 out of their tribal fund to assist them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3172. Also, petition of 11 Chippewa Indians of Waubun, Minn., praying for a per capita payment of \$100 out of their tribal fund to help them through the winter; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

3173. By Mr. WHITE of Kansas: Petition of George Morell and 51 other citizens of Collyer, Quinter, and Wakeeney, Kans., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3174. By Mr. WOODRUFF: Petition of citizens of Big Rapids, Mich., opposing any favorable action on Senate bill 3218, called the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.